

THE
EVANGELICAL
QUARTERLY REVIEW.

NO. LXIX.

JANUARY, 1867.

ARTICLE I.

ADDRESSES DELIVERED AT THE INAUGURATION OF PROFESSORS HAY AND VALENTINE IN THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE GENERAL SYNOD OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH, GETTYSBURG, PA.

THE CHARGE TO THE PROFESSORS.

By A. H. LOCHMAN, D. D., President of the Board of Directors.

BELoved IN THE LORD: You have been regularly elected and duly called to fill Professorships in this time-honored Theological Seminary, reared and fostered by, and under, the special care of the General Synod, and representing its doctrinal basis, its religious and churchly standpoint.

Having entire confidence in your piety and attainments, the Church, in reliance upon its Great Head, has, after mature and prayerful deliberation, called you from spheres of extensive usefulness in your respective charges, where you labored with marked success, to positions no less arduous and responsible, and yet, at the same time, of greater importance to the interests of our Church at large. With your faithful and devoted co-laborers, you are to

VOL. XVIII. No. 69. 1

unite your efforts in qualifying men to preach the gospel of the Son of God, to provide able and efficient pastors for the Church, men of the right stamp and spirit; men for the age—able to grapple with the great questions which are agitating the Church—workmen that need not be ashamed, rightly dividing the word.

Yours is a responsible position, fraught with consequences the most salutary, or baneful. You will mould and stamp the character, not only of the ministers, but, through them, also that of the Church.

Yours is, however, also a position of honor and dignity, not merely because of the confidence reposed in your piety and acquirements, and the unanimity by which you have been chosen, but also because the Great Head of the Church himself sustained the same position, and was the First Teacher of the first preachers of his gospel.

In view of the responsibility, you may, indeed, be constrained to exclaim: "Who is sufficient for these things;" yet, entering upon your duties in humble reliance upon divine aid, you may take courage in the thought: "Our sufficiency is of God."

The Institution, in which you are called to labor, whose interests you are to subserve, whose efficiency for good you are to advance, by every means in your power, has been deservedly enshrined in the hearts of the best men in the Church, enjoyed the benefits of the fervent, believing, effectual prayer of thousands, and has made its mark for good. He who cannot see this must be wilfully blind, and he who will not admit it, must be wilfully perverse.

Look at what, by the blessing of God, it has accomplished! It has sent forth scores of our ablest ministers, whose labors God has signally blessed. It has roused the Church from her slumber. It has called forth other similar Institutions and furnished the men to fill their Professorships. It has, together with Pennsylvania College, aided in raising the standard of education among our people. It has awakened a spirit of liberality amongst us. It has advanced the cause of piety and religion. We challenge a denial of these statements, and are willing to submit the matter to the testimony of impartial witnesses, "Our enemies themselves being the judges."

We would not, however, attempt to disguise the fact that you enter upon the duties of your stations under peculiarly trying circumstances. Charges of the most serious

character, are preferred against us with the most unblushing effrontery, and scattered broadcast throughout the Church; and whilst we repel these charges with a righteous indignation, it becomes you and your able co-laborers, with a faithful, conscientious and prayerful performance of your duties, producing its legitimate results, to falsify these charges and to place us before the world in our true character. Influences are at work to establish an extreme high Churchism, with its formalism, ritualism, and symbolism, in place of an enlightened, sanctified, active, progressive church-life and church feeling. These influences have at last culminated. The gauntlet has been thrown down and we are compelled for the glory of God, the cause of vital piety, the prosperity of our Church and the salvation of souls, to buckle on the whole armor of God, and take it up and battle manfully for the faith, once delivered to the saints, and craven is he, who, in this the day of our trial, wavers or falters in this conflict.

Brethren, my days of warfare have nearly passed; yet, while I see the danger to which our beloved Zion is exposed—while I see attempts made to fetter the consciences of men, to raise the Church above the religion of Christ, the Confessions above the Bible, Luther above Jesus Christ, I tremble, and look with fearful apprehensions to the future; nor would I wonder if attempts were made to forbid the people to read the Bible, except with their appended glossaries, or to deny them the right of private interpretation thereof.

Pardon this apparent digression, my beloved Professors elect, and you, members of the Board of Directors. I feel, therefore I speak. I may not have a long time to speak, therefore let me speak while I can. I glory in the cross of Christ. I feel proud of the record of our Church, and of the fair record of this hallowed Institution. I give place to no man in my estimation of the Confession of the Church. I honor the memory of the man whose name we bear, but whilst I love the Church of our fathers, I love the religion of Christ more. Whilst I hold in high estimation the Symbolical Books, I esteem the Bible still higher. Whilst I honor and revere Luther, I adore Jesus Christ. Like the apostle, I may be esteemed a fool in thus glorying; if so, with him I reply, ye have compelled me.

And thus, in the name of the Lord and for the glory of his name, the prosperity of our beloved Zion, the upbuild-

ing of his kingdom, I charge you, in the performance of your duties as Professors, in this "School of the Prophets," never to exalt the less above the greater, but ever make that which is human, subservient to that which is divine.

I charge you, to endeavor, by the grace of God, to bring the hearts and minds of your students in living, active sympathy with the Lord Jesus Christ, that, possessing the same mind, breathing the same spirit, burning with the same love, they may go forth and preach the unsearchable riches of Christ, to perishing men, with a zeal commensurate with the great end in view, with hearts glowing and burning with an experimental consciousness of the power and efficacy of divine grace.

I would by no means undervalue scientific and theological acquirements in the minister of the gospel, but I hesitate not to say, that however well qualified a man may be in this respect, if he be not brought into living sympathy with Jesus Christ and the great doctrines of the cross, he lacks the most important qualification of the gospel minister, and though his hearers may be gratified, they will not be much benefited; and though some may say, "What a treat we have enjoyed!" few will be constrained to cry, "Men and brethren, what must we do to be saved?"

I charge you to use your efforts to call forth and maintain in your students a heartfelt sympathy with the Church to which they belong, and of which they intend to become ministers—the Church as it was handed down and bequeathed to us by our fathers, as a precious legacy—a Church breathing the spirit of him whose name we were compelled to bear, as a reproach, but of which we have no cause to be ashamed. Placing himself upon the sure word of God, as the only basis of our faith, the only rule of our practice, he exclaimed: "Unless I am convinced out of the Sacred Scriptures and clear and cogent reasons, I cannot, and will not, retract anything I have written." "To the law and the testimony," was his test, so let it be ours.

We would, however, by no means have you ignore the Confessions of the Church. Let them be carefully studied, that they may be duly honored. They distinctly and clearly set forth the essential doctrines of our holy religion, and whilst they are properly regarded, the Church will be secure against heresy. They were a witness for the truth in the darkest times. But I charge you never

to exalt them above the Bible; they are at best but human productions, whilst the Bible is divine.

Teach your students, also, to value highly the time-honored usages of the Church, to keep in high regard her fondly cherished festivals and her catechetical instructions, so signally blessed of God. And as you, with them, study the historic records of the Church in by-gone ages, you will bring them in contact with minds which grasped the truth, as it is in Jesus, and with hearts which glowed with a heaven-kindled zeal for the glory of God, and the salvation of souls, and thus bringing them in closer sympathy with the Church of the past, you will fit them the better to love, labor and pray for the Church of the present.

I need not charge you to instruct your students thoroughly in the different departments of study assigned you by this Board, in the respective Professorships you were called to fill. The Board and the Church repose entire confidence, both in your ability and determination, with the help of God, to do your whole duty in this respect.

But then, we live in an age fraught with danger to the Church. We are bound by all honorable and righteous efforts to endeavor to counteract the influences brought to bear against her advancement in spirituality and Christian activity. This Institution, so signally blessed of God in bringing up the Church to the exigency of the times in which we live, has been stigmatized, as unsound in the faith, as *un-Lutheran*, as not meeting the demands of the Church. It, therefore, becomes its friends to rally round it, to consecrate to it their united fervent prayers and active efforts, to rouse our people, to stir up the friends of an enlightened, progressive, living Christianity, to sustain it, in order that we may furnish the Church with men of the proper character, who will stand up for Jesus, battle manfully for the truth, and seek to counteract the tendency of the age, not only in our own, but some other Churches also, to formalism, ritualism and Romanism. Some of our fathers of blessed memory, have toiled and labored to elevate the Church to what she should be, to infuse life, energy and zeal into her members, and we have reason to thank God that they have, in a great measure, succeeded. And shall we, their sons, look on indifferently, when we see efforts made which, if successful, will bring us back again to that state from which they so faithfully prayed and labored to deliver us?

Brethren, it becomes us to stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and not be entangled again with the yoke of bondage.

SACRED PHILOLOGY AND EXEGESIS.

By CHARLES A. HAY, D. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis.

The duty devolving upon the Faculty of a Theological Seminary, is the preparation of successive classes of young men for the discharge of the various and responsible functions of the pastoral office. Not, indeed, their entire preparation; for a part of this must be presupposed, as having been already accomplished, before they commence their theological studies. There must be presupposed, *e. g.*, the work of the Holy Ghost, in converting them and imparting to them the self-sacrificing missionary spirit, without which there can be no satisfactory proof of the genuineness of their call to the holy ministry. Then, there must have been also the concomitant indications of the divine will in this direction, confirming their inner call to this work and urging them forward in their special preparation for its duties. And it is also to be presumed that they have already become, to a considerable extent, intellectually prepared for this work by a course of general literary training, that has quickened their mental activity and rendered them familiar with men and things as they exist around them, and as they have existed in the past; familiar, to some extent also, with the literature of the past and of the present time; familiar, too, with the leading features of the Divine Word, of which they are to become the expounders. The greater the amount of this preliminary training, and of this general information already stored up by them, the more successful may we reasonably expect their subsequent course of study to be.

Presuming, then, that a Theological Faculty receives successive classes of young men, thus more or less fully prepared to enter upon a course of special training to fit them for their future office, their task at once assumes very definite and easily distinguishable features.

In the first place, it is their duty *sedulously* to encourage the growth of piety in their pupils, and aid them, by all the means within their power, in becoming more and more

firmly established in all that constitutes a well-developed Christian character. This part of their work is of supreme importance. It is by no means to be taken for granted that a residence in a Theological Seminary is of itself sufficient to warrant a steady growth in the divine life, or that a close application of the mind to the various branches comprised in the curriculum of theological study necessarily quickens the graces of the spirit or fosters holiness in the heart.

As the second branch of our duty we recognize the task of *making our pupils thoroughly familiar with the letter and spirit of the Divine Word*. This, and this alone, is the source whence these future heralds of the gospel, and shepherds of the Saviour's fold, are to draw the inspiration that is needed to sustain them in their high and holy calling, and here alone can they learn the terms of their great commission and the wisdom that is needful to direct in the discharge of all their pastoral duties.

We are to teach them, *thirdly, the most effective method of unfolding and exhibiting to others the meaning of the Divine Word, i. e., how to preach the gospel*, so as to become eminently successful in applying its truths to the hearts of their fellow-men, and thus winning them to Christ and his cause. It is not knowledge, even of divine things, for its own sake alone, that they are to seek, or we to impart, but knowledge of the Divine Word, and skill in handling it, for the sake of others, for the sake of Christ and his cause. We acknowledge the difficult task to be ours to teach them, both by precept and example, how rightly to divide the Word of truth, so that it may indeed be in their hands, the power of God unto salvation to them that hear.

Such we recognize to be the chief aims of our mission as a Theological Faculty; such, the momentous responsibility that rests upon us. We feel our insufficiency, and earnestly entreat your prayers on our behalf, that we may have wisdom and grace imparted to us sufficient for our day.

The time was, in our Church in this country, when the whole of this task was laid upon the shoulders of single individuals, here and there; and this, too, in addition to the labors of a large pastoral charge. The Church is to be congratulated upon the progress she has made in furnishing facilities for the more perfect accomplishment of this work by the establishment of institutions in which

the principle of the division of labor is adopted, and a number of persons employed, each of whom devotes himself exclusively to the work of facilitating the progress of the students in the particular sphere assigned to him. But it is also to be regretted, on the other hand, that she has gone from one extreme to the other; from having no theological schools to the establishment of too many. Were the teaching force that is now scattered among almost half a score of such institutions, concentrated in three, one in which the instruction was imparted in the English language, another for the German, and another for the Scandinavian brethren in the faith, then would the work of instruction be still more thoroughly accomplished, and many evils now existing in our Church, would be greatly diminished.

It should not occasion surprise if those who are called to labor in each of the various spheres of which we have spoken, should, every one, manifest a disposition to overestimate its comparative importance and unduly exalt it in contrast with the other departments of theological science. It would be proof, indeed, of a sluggish mind, and of great unfitness for his work, if a Professor in any of these departments did not exhibit at least some degree of enthusiasm in his peculiar field. In the sphere of Doctrinal Theology, for instance, how ennobling the employment, and how peculiarly calculated to inspire a lofty enthusiasm, to move among the great topics of thought that have commanded the attention of the master minds of all ages—themes that reach from heaven to hell, that compass time and eternity! In the sphere of the historical development of the divine plan for the redemption of our race—to trace the steps of God in the revolutions of all past time; to watch the budding forth of prophecy into history, and gather up fresh proofs of the divine origin of our holy faith, and of its inherent power to overcome the world and bring all things into subjection to Him who is the beginning and the end of all history, and without whom it is an inexplicable mystery. And, in the sphere of Sacred Philology and Exegesis,—the reverent handling of the Divine Word, in the very form in which it was at first communicated to mankind, the prolific, the inexhaustible, the *only authoritative* source of doctrine;—to dwell in the very treasure-house of truth;—to stand in the midst of the armory of God, called to distribute to those who

are to be champions of the cross the weapons of their warfare that "are not carnal, but mighty, through God, to the pulling down of strongholds."

Well may he be forgiven, whose undivided attention is devoted to any of these great topics, if he be found so enamored of its charms, that, even when occasion does not call, he seeks to press its claims upon the admiration of all around him. But I find my apology for directing your thoughts to the subject of *Sacred Philology and Exegesis*, in the fact that I have been called to labor mainly in this department, in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, and am expected, on the present occasion, to confine my remarks to the topics connected with it. This I shall do, all the more heartily, as I confess to a passionate fondness for it, and a glowing desire to enkindle in the minds of others a genuine appreciation of its importance, and an enthusiastic purpose to prosecute it with untiring zeal.

Surely no special stimulus should be needed to urge him to a diligent study of the languages in which the Scriptures were originally written whose life is to be spent in unfolding the meaning of these sacred documents to his fellow-men! These languages, in themselves considered, possess many claims upon our attention; the one, on account of its extreme antiquity, its charming simplicity and its inherent dignity of character; the other, as being the most highly developed and affluent of all ancient tongues, and as having been for many centuries the polite and the commercial language of the world. But their chief interest and importance to us we find in the fact of their having been selected as the vehicle of the Divine communications to mankind. Honored the land that was chosen to be the theatre for the displays of the Divine condescension to our fallen race! Honored, the men chosen to be the persons through whom these communications should be made! Honored, the languages that were to be the channel through which these messages of mercy were to be conveyed from heaven to earth! Above all other human tongues, these are destined to be held in reverence and devoutly studied, in all lands and in all ages. How widely mistaken are those who look upon the time and labor expended in acquiring a familiarity with these languages as in a great measure thrown away! It is, indeed, true that we already possess, in our own vernacular, an

admirable translation of these ancient records, which are thus brought within the reach even of the unlettered in a form sufficiently like the original to suffice for all the ordinary purposes of the common Christian life. But he, who is to be himself a teacher of others, in sacred things, should never consent to be entirely dependent upon the eyes of others for what he claims to see in the Divine Record, and thus to retail, at second hand, the treasures of holy truth. He should be able to draw at once from the original fountain, and dispense the heavenly gifts fresh from the hands of the Divine Giver.

It may be, that there is to be no advance in theological science; that no new doctrines remain to be discovered, and that no better arrangement can be made of those already known than that which our fathers have devised. Nevertheless, even if we were to admit that all the doctrines of the Sacred Scriptures have been already eliminated from the mass of narrative, and poetry, and prophecy, and epistle, and that all of these have been so classified and arranged that no further improvement is possible in this direction; still, it would require a familiar acquaintance with the languages in which the sources of these doctrines, &c, were at first communicated, to enable the learner to form an intelligent judgment concerning the accuracy and fidelity with which they had been extracted, and the wisdom with which they had been arranged. When this cannot be done, the results of others' labors must be taken with unquestioning confidence, and the faith of one teacher is thus made to depend entirely upon the word of another, instead of resting upon an intelligent and appreciative examination of the Divine Word itself, of which he believes himself called to be an authoritative expounder.

But the Divine Word is an inexhaustible mine. We need never approach it with the fear of finding that all its treasures have been already discovered. Much still remains to reward the patient research of the devout and diligent inquirer after truth. The great, fundamental principles of our holy religion are, indeed, so plainly revealed that even a child may readily discover them, and may so "know the Scriptures" as to be thereby "made wise unto salvation." But it requires more than childhood's discernment to discover the hidden harmony of successive dispensations, the incidental proofs of genuineness and au-

thenticity, the wonderfully complete, though often overlooked, symmetry and adaptation of parts, all blending together for the accomplishment of the one great purpose. Whilst the common saying of the Cabalists, that "upon every letter of the law hang mountains of sense," must be viewed rather as a proof of their own superstitious regard for the sacred text, than as a sound critical estimate of its real value; yet, on the other hand, he is, doubtless, just as far from the truth who ventures to assert that all the minor phases of Christian doctrine have been educed from the Divine Word and assigned to their proper place in the great system of truth therein revealed. As the believer, progressing in the divine life, always finds the Scriptures in advance of him, and never attains to such an elevation of holiness, as to be able to congratulate himself that he has now reached the summit of sinless perfection; so the student of the Divine Word, advancing in Scriptural knowledge, ever finds the horizon of revealed truth expanding around him, and impressing him with the conviction that still new fields of truth, yet unexplored, stretch far beyond the field hitherto swept by the keenest human vision.

We are not disposed, on the one hand, to join in the modern clamor for a new version of the Scriptures and new Confessions of faith; nor, on the other, can we sympathize with those who frown upon all independent investigation either of the letter or the meaning of the Divine Word, as if to question the accuracy of former translators or dogmatists were an almost sacriligious offence. We believe, *and shall endeavor to teach*, that the Sacred Scriptures are still to be made the theme of searching examination, both as to their form and signification; intending thereby no disrespect to those who have preceded us, and for the results of whose patient and successful labors we feel profoundly grateful. Well may we stand amazed when we view what they accomplished, in this direction, with the very inadequate helps that were within their reach. They were men of huge toil and of astounding perseverance. Through the dulness of the implements at their command, it became necessary for them to put to the more strength, and they shrunk not from the task. Shame upon us, of this more highly favored, but more restless and impatient and superficial age, that, with all our superior facilities, so

large a proportion of our professional interpreters of the Scriptures are so poorly equipped for their work, and are compelled, through sheer want of acquaintance with the Divine Word in its original form, to depend so largely upon the opinions of others as to its precise form and meaning!

The wonderful advances in the science of Philology during the present century, have rendered the study of these ancient languages a task far less laborious and difficult than in former times. We have great reason to congratulate ourselves that the scant and clumsy Grammars and Lexicons of former days, so illy arranged and poorly equipped as to occasion perpetual annoyance and disappointment to the learner, have given place to others constructed upon well established principles of Philosophical Philology, and so admirably arranged, and so richly furnished with appropriate illustrations as to render the study of these languages both easy and attractive. We learn these tongues no longer by rote; we find their materials classified according to their root-forms, and their normal and abnormal development of these, by internal modifications and by accretions from without, unfolded in a manner so full of interest as to lead us, step by step, almost imperceptibly, into a familiarity with their form and meaning. New interest, too, is added to this study, by the diligence and accuracy with which the history of the individual words has been traced. Words change their meaning. They are the vehicles of thought, but not always and everywhere of the same thought. Historical changes leave their impress upon living languages, an impress indestructible and highly instructive. Conquering armies leave their mark upon the soil, but this is soon obliterated. Waving harvests quickly clothe the fields but recently stained with human gore, and special pains are needed to preserve for the inspection of coming generations even the most durable indications of the presence and vandalism of an invading foe. But the footprints left by the march of events upon the languages of the day, are not so easily obliterated. New words are introduced, old ones are newly applied, fresh idioms come into vogue, new shades of thought call for new forms of expression, and so the language of an age comes, in its varied form, to represent and embody the very soul of the age itself. This is no novel

phenomenon. What we behold thus transpiring around us, and with our own language, has been illustrated in all ages and in the development of all languages. The genial appreciation of this truth, and the diligent application of these principles to the study of the sacred tongues of antiquity, has thrown around them a continually increasing interest and exhibited more and more clearly the intimate relationship between Sacred Philology and all the other departments of Theological Science. The clearly ascertained meaning of the Divine Word, which can be educed only by the application of correct principles of Biblical Criticism, is the only firm basis of Christian doctrine and the only absolutely authoritative rule of holy living. In this sense Sacred Philology may be said to underlie and condition all sound theological thinking, and all true practical piety. To the evangelical Pastor, an ever increasing familiarity with this science furnishes the most direct and constant help to the thorough comprehension of the revealed will of God. By its assistance he is enabled to catch more completely the very spirit of the sacred writers, and to embody and set forth the same more successfully to his hearers. His labors are thereby at the same time greatly lightened and made doubly useful. His hearers learn to recognize in him *a truly capable and trustworthy expounder of the Divine Word*. They congratulate themselves upon having, as a Pastor, not a mere brilliant essayist, who, under the cover of a Scripture text, seeks to make a display of his own talents and acquirements, but one who honestly and earnestly strives to ascertain and then unfold to them *the mind of the Spirit as revealed in the Word of God*.

It shall be our humble endeavor, in reliance upon Divine aid, without which no human effort can be successful, so to lead our pupils forward in this branch of their theological studies, as that they shall leave our Institution fully intent upon, and well prepared for, a lifelong devotion to its prosecution. And we shall do this in the confident expectation that they will thereby become constantly more firmly established in the true faith of the gospel, once delivered to the saints, left upon record in the Word of God and so clearly set forth by our fathers in the noble Confession of Augsburg.

THE RELATION OF SACRED HISTORY TO PROPER THEOLOGICAL EDUCATION.

By MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., Professor of Church History and Ecclesiastical Polity.

In appearing here, this evening, in obedience to your call, I am deeply sensible of the weight of responsibility which I am thus consenting to assume. The position assigned me has presented itself as connected with such important interests of our Theological Seminary, and of the Church, as to awaken a feeling of self-mistrust in undertaking its duties. Impressed, however, with the conviction that your spontaneous call contained an indication of Providence, I could not decline, while I tremble to accept. I have now taken the obligation to enter upon the work. And I am encouraged, not only by a strong confidence in your cordial and generous support, but by a belief that I am in the way of duty, and in that way, shall realize the meaning of the truth written by a holy apostle, "*Our sufficiency is of God.*"

A year has passed since your call was put into my hands. Many a look has been given toward the work. Each successive contemplation of it, has deepened the first sense of its extent and importance. You will allow me to speak of it now, as indicated in the name you have given to the chair of instruction that I am to occupy. You will not take it amiss that my mind is full of the work to which you have appointed me, and that I desire to engage your thoughts with it, in connection with this solemn act of inauguration. I wish, modestly, to "magnify my office," in briefly calling your attention to

The Relation of Sacred History to a proper Theological Education. This, I am sure, is a subject of much interest, not only to those of you who are the official guardians of the Seminary, but to all who desire its prosperity and usefulness.

I use the word "Sacred," not in its strict, technic, but in a general, familiar, sense, as inclusive of both Biblical and Ecclesiastical, History;—Sacred, in distinction from Profane or Secular, History. The theological education of our Seminary, is understood to have for its aim the preparation of an able and efficient ministry. The relations of Sacred History, in this ample sense, to such a theological

training, are, probably, closer and more important than is generally supposed. It is doubtful whether we are adequately impressed with the value of the Historical department of instruction in a Seminary education.

I. A close survey of the *field* of this department of study can hardly fail to deepen our conviction of its importance to the student of Theology. It may, indeed, at first glance, look uninviting and unproductive. To many, Sacred History seems a dull and profitless field of exploration. Some departments of investigation and mental activity call men to stand right in the midst of the living questions and realities of the age, where the flash and rush of present movements draw and stir the interest of the mind. But this field of history calls back into the silence and shadows of the "dead past." It appears to offer to the reluctant student but a sojourn in a valley of dry bones, with skeletons of the past to strew the ground, or a tiresome wandering along dusty channels, where the once living, rushing stream has left only the dry rounded stones to engage the sight, or a tedious measurement of the lines and positions and obsolete questions of old battle-fields, silent and profitless. Some would, perhaps, turn from it as worthy only of the singular curiosity of the antiquarian instinct. But, understood aright, this department is neither dull nor useless. It opens, and pours into our minds, the lessons of many centuries. If we walk through it, with the ears of the soul open, we shall hear every channel vocal with its old stream, and every battle-ground resounding with the conflict of the grand principles that struggled and triumphed there. Its sketches become panoramic exhibitions of the life and power of Christianity. It is no tame or barren thing to traverse the ground of Christian history, where we are made to feel the touch of events that not only stirred the heart of the acting generation, but have filled centuries with their report, and left their impress on the Church to this day. From the light of the past, we best understand the present, and discern the hopes of the future. But permit me to recall a few features of this field.

1. It is wide and varied. In entering this department, we cannot but feel that there is a grand sketch of time and space from which we are to gather. It is no garden patch, productive, but small. The field covers the lapse of time, and the breadth of the territory of both Judaism and

Christianity. To begin at the beginning, we have to go back across the ages to the origin of our race. We draw treasures of sublime knowledge from periods before Secular History had a line. After the records of Geology, written by God in earth's deep and solid rocks, no records throw back light so far as those of Sacred History. Its first pages are luminous with the Mosaic vision of creation, and introduce the race, with whose welfare and salvation this history should be concerned. It is a long line of events, whose farther end is dim by the distance, till we reach the "fulness of time," where we are met by the central and all-controlling event of history. From that time until now, the grace and providence of God have been filling up the records that we are to read and master. The field has *widened* far over the earth, in the spread of Christianity. And all along its border is a broad margin of interlacing with Profane History—a line of meeting and blending of the two spheres of life represented in the secular and divine. All through, we have a cheering and instructive variety. There are the enlarging boundaries of the geographical extension of Christianity, to be traced, and the development of Christian doctrine and confessional formulæ. We are drawn to the discussions of grand Councils, whose decrees gave new form to Church dogmas; and turning to the "philosophy of History," we trace the outward phenomena to their latent causes and far-reaching consequences. The Divine religion, long confined to the narrow progress of the Semitic race, but at length joined with the wide destinies of the sons of Japheth, is exhibited to view under the shaping influence of every form of national life and circumstance. The greatness of this field of study, almost discouraging the attempt to explore it, is yet an assurance to the theologian, that he cannot afford to neglect it. It is needful to a proper understanding and appreciation of the present forms and relations of Christianity.

2. But the field, so large, is rich. It is encouraging as we enter the department of Sacred History, to know that its immense compass is not a barren region, to be wandered drearily through and offering nothing to gather. We are brought into a "wealthy place." It is the Ophir and Golconda of History. The study of General History is confessedly a very richly instructive province of mental exploration. It is not science in theory, but exhibits it

in action, and its fruits. It is not Philosophy, but it teaches philosophy by example. It is not Politics, but is the storehouse of political wisdom. It is not Law, but the domain on which law is seen wielding its power. But far richer than Civil, are the grounds of Biblical and Ecclesiastical History. You cannot measure them without travelling over every part of the world where the richest light of heaven has fallen, and the best mind and heart of humanity have wrought and acted. The Alps and Andes of human thought, lifted under the light and by the power of Christianity, appear on the landscape of Christian history. The history of the Church is the record of the greatest purity, elevation and opulence of human effort, in the noblest aims. "Christendom," it has been well said, "is merely another name for the most civilized, the most powerful, the most important nations of the modern habitable world." If the Sun of Righteousness has risen on the earth, with better and more fruitful illumination than the natural sun, we are called to walk where its light shines and its fruits ripen and fall. "The proper study of mankind is man;" but man is most a man when Christianized, and moulded by the ennobling, regulative power of redemption. Valuable lessons may be gathered in regions where gross darkness and depravity reign, unrelieved by any illumination of gospel light. Even the gloomy fields of middle and Southern Africa, yield instruction to the explorer. The burning sands of Sahara afford lessons to the inquiring. We find ourselves in the midst of affluent stores when we range through the learning, literature and philosophy of the cultured mind of Pagan Greece or Rome. Their civilization was high, and our moralists, orators, statesmen and philosophers enrich themselves from those treasures of the past. Egypt, the land of early science and power, still yields valuable knowledge to those who search for it, among her pyramids, sphinxes, and wrapped up mummies. But it is our privilege to gather along the pathway of Christian civilization, enlightenment and power, where Divine Philosophy has touched and elevated human philosophies, where the Science of God has given its clearing ray to the human mind for the understanding of this world's science, where Law has lost its harshness in the spirit of Mercy, and been made to glow in the features of the "higher law" of Jehovah, and society has been eleva-

ted and refined, where the best institutions of Love have grown up, and industry, trade and commerce exhibit their largest results, and nations have attained their best eminence of power and influence. In following the stream of Christianity, we are guided into the earth's green pastures and led beside its still waters. The grounds we walk, though not all "holy grounds," are filled with great and teaching events—the events through which the face of the world has been changed—and along the line of the earth's grandest progress to the sublime things yet in store for it. We range where, indeed, we see much folly, and even burning wickedness, but where, still, we are brought into contact with the best wisdom that men have ever practised, and the best holiness they have ever exhibited—where Moses and Elias, and Paul, and Augustine, and Luther, and Calvin, and all the great and good, appear clustered about Jesus, talking with Him, and receiving His Light. They all say: "*It is good to be here.*" It is the ground on which has evermore been fulfilling the promise: "Greater works than these shall ye do because I go unto the Father. It is the ground where are seen the grand moral miracles of the Truth, which stir the heart and enrich our stores.

3. It is a feature of wealth in this field, to the theological student, that it opens a comprehensive and striking exhibition of the providence of God. As a student of *Theology*, it is his object to know and understand God. This knowledge should be not *only* by an experience of his grace and salvation, through faith in Christ. For his office, as a teacher and preacher in the Church, he should well understand God, as to His ways in the moral government of providence in the world. His mind is enriched with Divine light, in proportion as he gets near to God, in any of the ways of His self-disclosure. Of course, it is in Theology proper, out of the doctrinal statements of the word, that he obtains the surest and clearest understanding of Jehovah. There Christ has revealed the invisible God. But, "God is in History." This is an expression, often put as an assurance of its great worth, as a department of study. Bancroft, in his History Discourses, exalts it with the remark: "The prayer of the patriarch when he desired to behold the Divinity face to face, was denied; but he was able to catch a glimpse of Jehovah, after He had passed by; and so fares it with our search for Him in the wrestlings of the world. It is when the hour of conflict

is over, that *History* comes to a right understanding of the strife, and is ready to exclaim: 'Lo, God is here and we knew it not.' At the foot of every page in the annals of nations may be written, 'God reigns.' Events as they pass away, 'proclaim their Original,' and if you will but listen reverently, you may hear the receding centuries, as they roll into the dim distance of departed Time, perpetually chanting, '*Te deum laudamus.*'" So felt the secular historian, thrust into contact with the acting of God in the movements of common History. But, more distinctively is God in the history of His Church. This is peculiarly the sphere of His movement and power among men. It is the presence-place of the Divine in human affairs. "Out of *Zion* * * God hath shined." The Church is the world's shekinah—the place from which God manifests Himself. We realize Him speaking to us from every page of its annals. He unfolds His power, wisdom and love in its striking deliverances and instructive experiences. The movements of Church History are *full* of God; and the theologian never attains his proper *wealth* of the knowledge of Him, if he fills not his stores with the gatherings of this field.

4. We are not to forget, too, that in this study, we attain, as far as it is possible to do anywhere, a view of the practical working, and aggregate power of Christianity. An exhibition of eighteen centuries of Christianity *in action*, developing its character, illustrating its energy, "turning the world upside down," we must not neglect, if we would rightly understand and appreciate it.

"To restore a common-place truth," some one has written, "to its first uncommon lustre, you need only translate it into action." The history of the Church presents such a translation of the truths and doctrines of the Gospel, and offers incessant illustration of their beauty and power. Truth *is* power—the grandest known to earth. Its victories are the grandest. On the pages of history, it is seen to be no dead abstraction, but a living energy. We need not study long here, to be assured, by their quickening touch on mind, conscience and life, of the falseness of Schleiermacher's idea, that "The doctrines of faith, are, so to speak, cooled lava." They are shown to be the germinal force, from which new life has sprung and the grandest potencies have wrought. History gives us, indeed, no illustration of Christianity in its perfect ideal;

for the imperfectness, inertia and resistance of the material with which religion works, always cause short-coming in the actualization of its virtues and power. Yet each of its truths gains much in liveliness and capacity of being understood and appreciated by being viewed through the medium of the lives and characters of men. Indeed, we ought to regard it as an instructive fact in this connection, that, in his Word, God has chosen to convey, in great measure, the doctrines and precepts of Christianity, in the form of History. It is well known that this form has given them a substance, vitality and variety, which no method of abstract instruction could yield. Ecclesiastical History is doing this for them continually. It protographs before our view, again and again, the noblest virtues that "truth and grace" produce, and in which Christianity, embodying itself, becomes as a "city set on a hill," incapable of being hid. It exhibits before our view the best specimens of faith and hope and love, the most striking and instructive self-denial, energy and heroism. Our conceptions of the power and support of Christianity are exalted, when we see the sublime zeal of the missionary as he has ranged through the darkness of heathenism with the torch of the gospel, when we converse with the Confessor in his prison, and the martyr at the burning stake. We are furnished, in the character and deeds of Christians, with a living Bible—gospels and epistles written, by the Truth and Spirit, on human hearts, "known and read of all men." We walk through avenues of events that furnish, perpetually, fresh proofs of the endless vigor and vitality of the simple verities of our religion. In a progress and victories that perplex a Gibbon, and in an impregnability that has withstood the shocks of assaulting power, philosophy and malice, we read continual demonstrations of the Divine origin of the Church, and hear fresh echoes of the truth, "The gates of hell shall not prevail against it." We cannot but know more, and better of our holy religion from a survey of this field of its activity and power, where its energies and principles have been tested and illustrated. From the continued views it gives, of unconquerable *faith*, holding to the unseen against the power of things seen and temporal, sublime *constancy* and heroic steadfastness in the face of persecution and suffering, self-sacrificing and cementing *love*, melting away all social and national distinctions, and by its

holy fruits forcing from heathen lips the expression: "Behold how these Christians love one another," we are better prepared to preach the gospel as of God, and throw a lively interest into its illustration. "Reading," declares Lord Bacon, "makes a full man." And the "fulness" of knowledge which the theologian obtains from the history of the Church, becomes a most opulent store for the elucidation and enforcement of the truth.

II. But not alone from this survey of the field are we taught the value of Sacred History. We must view it in its relations to other departments of theological education. It moves in the midst of a company of studies, of which the rule holds, "If one member suffers, all the members suffer with it." Those departments which are usually looked upon as most vital to a proper preparation for the ministry, are affected by this.

1. It sustains a close relation to the Exegetical department. History is, indeed, one of the eyes of Hermeneutics. It is true that the Historian uses the labors of the Exegete. He finds here one source of his historical facts. But the general course and facts of History, both archaeological and ecclesiastical, throw light, in turn, on the exegesis of the sacred page. The clue to the explanation of many a passage, is given in the result of the historian's investigations. We would not be far wide of the truth, to say that the history of the Church is a long heaven-furnished commentary on the Holy Bible. In its chapters, it becomes the echoes of the statements of the inspired Scriptures. The interpretation of prophecy is well known to be in the historian's records. He who would enter into the prophecies without the key of history, would soon find the gates all locked to him. We must recall the various fortunes of the Church for a proper explanation and illustrations of our Lord's parables which unfold the course of the kingdom of heaven. We will fail to unravel the difficulties of His words concerning the overthrow of Jerusalem "and the end of the world," without a knowledge of the facts which, forty years later, were put into the records of history. We must read these records, to understand the presence of the "abomination of desolation," and the gathering together of "the eagles" around the lifeless carcass. How should we comprehend the statement: "*The children of Israel shall abide many days without a king, and without a prince, and without a*

sacrifice, and without an image, and without an ephod, and without a teraphim," Hosea 3 : 4 ; or the interpretation : "His blood be on us and on our children," without the history of the Jews since the day when the sword of Titus dispersed them, far from the seat of their worship, a reproach and a bye-word among the nations.

Besides this necessity of History for the elucidation of much of the Divine Word, many of its passages, from both the Old and New Testaments receive a peculiar illumination and force in the light of the annals of the Church. Many texts have become associated with grand events and glorious achievements in the progress of Christendom, which double the interest with which we read them, and the magnitude of meaning we obtain from them. We find our minds grasping, with a peculiarly vigorous hold, a passage by which we know the hard, rebellious heart of Augustine was melted and subdued, (Rom. 13 : 13, 14. See Conf., p. 204), or which made Antony go his way and sell all that he had, (Matt. 19 : 21) On one verse, spoken to Peter, we see up-built the colossal power of the Papacy. In a single sentence written by St. Paul, hallowed by its association with the conversion of Luther, we behold the grand, comprehensive truth that wrought the Reformation. The very text of inspiration is read with clearer understanding and livelier emotion, as we read it under the light of the historical events in which its meaning and vitality have been exhibited. Dr. Stanley declares of the Book of Psalms : "By its manifold applications and uses in after times, it is a vast palimpsest, written over and over again, illuminated, illustrated, by every conceivable incident and emotion of men and of nations ; battles, wanderings, dangers, escapes, death-beds, obsequies, of many ages and countries, rise, or may rise, to our view as we read it." It is plain, that the highest and happiest success, in unfolding the meaning and force of the Holy Scriptures, requires familiarity with the records of Ecclesiastical History ; and that this department, in our Seminary, works together with the Exegetical, in making, of our students, ministers who shall be "mighty in the Scriptures."

2. To the department of Christian Theology, our work holds a relation equally as close as to that of Exegesis. The department of dogmatics, probably, holds the nearest connection with the education of the ministry. The Dogmatic Professor, of course, draws the truths of Theology

from the pure fountain-head of God's Word. But the *History* of doctrine, comes in as an auxiliary in explaining the present forms and statements of the doctrine itself. "*Church History*," declares Giesler, "*is indispensable to the Christian theologian who desires to acquire a scientific knowledge of Christianity*," (Eccl. Hist., § 7 of Introduction.) The Christian Doctrines in their present forms and features, as taught in Systematic Divinity, have taken so much of their hues and shape from the conflicts and circumstances through which they have passed—bear so many marks of their progress on them—that they are best understood when traced in their gradual formation and development. It is true, that each Christian doctrine is perfect in the Word of God from the first, but the Church's comprehensive and systematic statement of it, is gradual and progressive, and is much affected by the Church's subjective life and local pressure upon it. We learn, thus, to look on the doctrines as we now confess and proclaim them, as the Church's most matured conception and statement of the eternal and changeless truths of God's Word—as gold tried in the fire and indestructible. The very heresies which the Truth has disowned and thrown off, left along the way of its progress, help to mark the definitions and limitations that characterize the instructions of Dogmatic Theology. The student of Dogmatics has much to learn at the feet of History. It is a work to expand the most liberal mind, and enlarge the largest heart, to trace the biography of each of the great evangelical doctrines comprising our holy faith. Each one has had a life of its own, and a history of its own. The theologian is enriched by mastering its biography.

It is no small part of the benefit of the history of Christian doctrine, that by establishing the fact of this law of development in the Church's apprehension and statement of the immutable doctrines of the Divine Word, it saves the student from a tendency, sometimes shown, to deny the Church the right to amend its statements of theological doctrine, with the assertion that it must stand by its first confessional expression, or perish. It discloses the principle that while all centuries must ite themselves fast to the Bible, no century is tied to all, and only, the measure of truth a preceding one, with its yet incomplete examination, may have confessed as the meaning of the inspired Word. And in the fact that progress and devel-

opment in the understanding and confession of God's truth have characterized the aggregate Christian Church, it is made plain, that the same may properly be expected to mark the history of any particular branch of the true Church of Christ.

The requisites in a proper theological training, therefore, its seems to me, include much attention to this department of study. There have been times, in the progress of the Church, when the study of its history was neglected and depreciated. But in our day, great pains and research are being expended in this direction. There has been a revival of historic inquiry. The students of our Institution should be furnished with the most extensive and accurate training in this department, that it is possible to give. The progress of the Church, in its trials, conflicts and victories, ought to lie plainly on the mind of the theologian. The Epistle to the Hebrews teaches us to enroll and remember, the heroes of the faith. And if we pursue the study of Church History, not alone in its dry details, but as Guizot has taught us in secular annals, striking down into its deep philosophy, or as Neander has led the way in Ecclesiastical History itself, tracing the real life of Christ in humanity, it must necessarily nerve our conviction of the divinity of Christianity, enlarge and liberalize our view of the Church, and her well-tried and settled doctrines, and help our qualification for an efficient ministry.

In this Seminary, consecrated to the education of a ministry for the Lutheran Church, it is proper and necessary that there should be a thorough training in our own denominational history. No portion of Christendom has so interesting, grand, and instructive a history as the Lutheran Church. No one, we believe, has reached a doctrinal development, so closely in harmony with the absolute and eternal truth of the Divine Word. Our students should pass out from the walls of our Seminary with hearts deeply impressed with the nature and grandeur of the spiritual regeneration in which our Church took form, and with minds well stored with a knowledge of her life and progress. The position of our Church, as including the most direct and largest current in the stream of revived Christianity, the influence she has wielded in the formation of the creeds and life of other denominations of Protestantism, the extent of her communion, and the opulence of

her literary and theological stores, make her history of exceeding value to the theologian of any Church, and indispensable to one of our own. This must receive no ordinary attention, in the studies of this department. Such is my view of the general relations of this branch of instruction.

In humility, but with an earnestness stimulated by the manifest importance of the work to which you have called me, I shall now enter upon it, hoping for both your indulgence and approval, and looking for the help and blessing of Him who "loved the Church and gave Himself for it."

ARTICLE II.

REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MINISTERS.

LXVI.

BENJAMIN KURTZ, D. D. LL. D.

FEW men have wielded a greater influence in the Lutheran Church of this country, than the subject of the present sketch. He was one of our most prominent, faithful, laborious and successful ministers. His public career extending over a half century, was identified with the most important events in the history of our Church during that period. His power was felt, no matter with what interest he was associated. His name was a tower of strength in connection with any enterprise which engaged his attention. A man of large capacity and earnest sympathies, decided in his character and devoted to his friends, he exercised a magnetic power, such as is rarely possessed, over all who were gathered under his influence. The recognized leader of a central school in the Church, the public representative of the party whose views he adopted, his sentiments on all subjects were regarded with favor. His words were received as oracular. His life, too, was one of ceaseless activity. He labored with industry and zeal in the various positions of usefulness to which he was called.

Every object to which he devoted himself, found in him an able advocate and a fearless champion. Skilful in the use of his pen, eloquent in the defence of his opinions, versed in all questions of interest, literary and political, ardent in the maintenance of any cause which he espoused, communicative and attractive in social intercourse, it is not strange that he so cordially won the attachment of his friends and excited the active opposition of those who differed from him, that his presence was felt, and his influence acknowledged in every department of labor which he occupied.

Benjamin Kurtz was born in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, on the 28th of February, 1795. He was a lineal descendant of one of the Halle Patriarchs, the grandson of Rev. John Nicholas Kurtz, who came to this country in 1745, as an associate of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg in his missionary labors, and who was the first Lutheran minister ordained in this country, at the first Synodical meeting, held in 1748. The names of his parents were Benjamin and Elizabeth Kurtz, who were much respected for their industry and integrity in the community in which they lived, and who endeavored to impress upon the minds of their children the great truths of the Gospel. The childhood and youth of Benjamin were marked by a freedom from all vicious tendencies, and by seasons of deep religious convictions. His earliest impressions he traced to his eighth and twelfth year in connection with the reading of God's Word and his attendance upon the services of the Presbyterian Church. These serious impressions were, for a time, apparently effaced from his mind, and it was not until he reached his eighteenth year, after having passed through a most painful struggle, that he experienced, as he supposed, a change of heart. "Rev. Dr. Lochman was chiefly instrumental," he says, "in leading me to an acquaintance with the Saviour of sinners."

When quite young, he exhibited remarkable fondness for study and great quickness in the acquisition of knowledge. His progress was rapid and thorough. At the age of fifteen he was employed as an Assistant in the Harrisburg Academy, of which he had been a pupil. Subsequently he gave private instruction in Latin and Greek, and also in the German language. He was thus early trained to industry and self-reliance, to those habits of

mental discipline which gave so much strength and energy to his character in his future career.

He was designed by his father for the legal profession, and an arrangement for the prosecution of his studies had already been made with Hon. Amos Ellmaker, of Lancaster, as his Preceptor. But through the influence of a pious grandmother, such a prejudice had been awakened in the young man's mind against the profession, that he felt as if he could not engage in its study. "I am unwilling," he said to his father, "to become a lawyer; I will consent to be a shoemaker, a tailor, or any thing else, but I desire most of all to be a minister of the gospel." The father, although disappointed in his expectations, yielded to the son's wishes, and very soon, at the age of eighteen, we find him diligently and earnestly engaged in the study of Theology, under the direction of Rev. Dr. George Lochman, then of Lebanon, Pa., to whom students at that day from different parts of the Church resorted, and for whose memory Mr. Kurtz, until the end of life, cherished a most profound veneration.

He was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Pennsylvania, at its convention, held in Frederick, Maryland, in the spring of 1815, and immediately received a call to Baltimore as Assistant Minister to his uncle, Rev. Dr. J. Daniel Kurtz, and subsequently as Pastor of a contemplated English Lutheran congregation in the same city. The latter appointment he declined, and after remaining a few months in the service of the German Church, he accepted the invitation to become Pastor of the Hagerstown charge, which, at the time, consisted of five congregations. When he entered upon his duties, he was the only Lutheran Pastor in the County, (Washington.) When he resigned his position, sixteen years later, the same territory embraced six pastorates, and the numerical strength of the Church, notwithstanding the numerous emigrations to the West, had been more than quadrupled. Dr. Kurtz's labors, during this period of his ministry, were crowned with the most wonderful success. Youthful as he was, he had no difficulty in sustaining himself, and rapidly rose in public estimation. A zealous advocate of catechetical instruction, large numbers attended the exercises. On a single occasion, preparatory to the Holy Communion, he added to the Church by the rite of Confirmation, one hundred and fifteen members. Extensive revivals of religion ac-

accompanied his efforts, and through his instrumentality many Mennonites, and the young of no denominational predilection were brought under religious influences. During the first few years of his ministry he preached exclusively in the German language, but he was soon convinced, that unless English services were introduced into the sanctuary the interests of the Church would suffer, the members would ultimately be dispersed. Although there was much opposition to the measure, he was allowed to preach English every six weeks, afterwards every four, then every two weeks, and finally every Sunday evening. Here, as elsewhere, the Germans adhered with great tenacity to their vernacular tongue. He also encountered great difficulties, and even personal persecution, in connection with his efforts in the Temperance Reform and Revivals of Religion, and the introduction of Prayer-meetings and Sunday Schools into his congregations. But in the course of time great changes were effected. Those who had been most hostile to these measures, became their most zealous advocates and his warmest friends. He triumphed over all opposition. Under the influence of his faithful preaching and laborious pastoral ministrations multitudes were reached by the truth, inquirers were directed, sinners converted, and the people of God led to higher attainments in piety and greater efficiency in the service of their Master. Although more than thirty years have passed away since he left this field of labor, his name is still pronounced with affectionate interest, the influence of his labors is still felt. Very reluctantly he resigned this position in 1831, and, in obedience to the wishes of the brethren, took charge of our Lutheran interests in Chambersburg, which were in a languishing condition. So desirous were the members of the Hagerstown charge to retain his services that they proposed to wait on him a whole year, if, on its expiration, he would consent to return and resume the pastoral relation. But he declined the proposition. Influenced by a sense of duty, he enters upon his new field of labor, full of zeal and devotion to the great work to which he had consecrated his life, and although his ministry here was brief, embracing a period of only two years, it was eminently successful, productive of the happiest results. He was now in the full splendor of his powers and in the zenith of his fame. His pulpit efforts were of a high order, and his influence was salutary upon the whole community. The

number of his communicants had more than doubled, and the Church was favored with precious revivals of religion, of which some of the most prominent citizens of the place, members of the legal and medical profession, many of whom had been reckless and entirely indifferent to the claims of the gospel, were the subjects. Among the number was the Speaker of the Pennsylvania House of Representatives, who attended the course of catechetical instruction, subsequently became a teacher in the Sunday School and a leader in the devotions of the congregation and continued till his death a consistent, exemplary and useful member of the Church.

But in the midst of his usefulness, with a heart full of zeal and the brightest prospects of ministerial success before him, the labors of Mr. Kurtz at Chambersburg were abruptly terminated. The precarious condition of his health and frequent hemorrhages from his lungs, accompanied with imperative medical counsel, led him to lay aside the active duties of his work. His first intentions were to seek retirement in the country on a farm, that his physical system might speedily be recuperated and his wasted energies repaired, but before his purpose could be carried into execution a situation in a Banking Institution was tendered him, his reputation as a business man being generally acknowledged. The offer he promptly declined, as the duties required were entirely of a secular character, and incongruous, as he thought, with his sacred calling. Although unable to preach, he did not wish to withdraw from the ministry. He cherished the hope that at no very distant day he might resume the work, in which he so much loved to labor.

About this time, he was strongly urged to remove to Baltimore and take charge of the *Lutheran Observer*. Rev. Dr. Morris, who had established the paper and conducted it with ability for two years, found that the proper discharge of the editorial office interfered with his pastoral duties. He, therefore, offered the position to Dr. Kurtz without any pecuniary consideration, and suggested that he should devote himself exclusively to the work. The kind offer, after mature deliberation, was accepted, and, on the 24th of August, 1833, he commenced his editorial career in Baltimore, having had one year's previous experience in connection with a religious newspaper, published at Chambersburg. The *Observer*, at the time he took charge

of it, was a semi-monthly with seven hundred subscribers. It was very soon converted into a *folio*, and a *weekly*. The number of subscribers multiplied, and when he retired from the office, the subscription list embraced upwards of eight thousand names. The paper became an engine of great influence in the Church, and although physically disqualified to perform regular pulpit labor, Dr. Kurtz in his editorial capacity was permitted every week to preach the gospel, and to advance the interests of the Church. For nearly thirty years he retained the position.

The last two or three years of his life Dr. Kurtz's health became gradually more impaired, yet he occasionally preached and wrote for the press. In other ways, in connection with the various Institutions and Associations with which he was identified, he also endeavored to make himself useful. During the last months of his life he was confined to the house, and passed through severe physical suffering, yet he was submissive, and, whilst he anxiously awaited the hour of his departure, cordially acquiesced in God's will. During his long and painful illness he gave the clearest evidence of the strength of his faith and the fulness of his patience. He confidently rested his head and his heart upon that cross, which for half a century he had presented to others, and beautifully illustrated in his personal trials and conflicts the power of divine grace. During life he had often been perplexed with doubts and fears as to his spiritual condition and his acceptance with God, but these all vanished as he approached eternity. Every difficulty was removed and his trust in Jesus was simple and unreserved. To a brother in the ministry he said: "All my life have I been preaching the necessity of faith, but never until now have I understood the full significance of the passage, 'Except ye be converted, and become as a *little child*, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven.'" Again he said: "I have attempted to reason too much. I have been troubled with doubts, and have expressed them to some pious friends, with a hope that they might be able to comfort me and remove the difficulties, but they failed to do it. What I needed was to become as a *little child*. It took me long to learn this, but at last, at last, I have found the secret, that this, and this alone, is the solution of my doubts. Argument would never have removed them. I needed to become as a *little child*." At another time he remarked: "I do not know why God

causes me to linger so long. I think it must be to perfect my patience. I never had much of that. But I am learning it every day." He earnestly desired as the world receded from his view, to depart and be with Christ. This was the subject on which he delighted to dwell. "I have travelled," said he to the Rev. Irving Magee, "over a large part of two continents. I have stood on the top of the Alps and by the side of the cataract of Niagara. I have visited the most magnificent scenery in the world. I have been an enthusiastic student of history. I have studied philosophy and regaled myself with the rich treasures of knowledge. I have shared the society of the cultivated of both hemispheres. I have stood in the presence of kings and queens and been the recipient of their favors. I have, also, visited the humble abodes of the poor and the lowly. I have gone, too, where men are accustomed to seek innocent pleasure. But I do assure you, I have come back from it all, realizing in my innermost soul 'that Christ is all, and in all.'" He spoke much of the joys of heaven, of the "many mansions in his Father's house," and of that blessedness which, through the merits of the Redeemer, was in reversion for him. On a certain occasion, when sitting in his arm-chair deeply absorbed in thought, he was asked what was engaging his attention, his reply was, "I am communing with Jesus, my Saviour." On another occasion, the name of a friend with whom he had had a controversy, having been incidentally introduced, he said: "I have no unkind feeling towards him, and when I have gone, I dare say, no one will speak more kindly of me than he." He seemed to enjoy perfect peace with man and God, to be self-composed, cheerful, affectionate and happy in the prospect of death. A calm radiance rested upon his soul. He passed away in the full possession of his mental faculties, on the 29th of December, 1865, and in 71st year of his age. He was carried to the grave on the first day of the New Year, amid a large concourse of devoted friends, including venerable ministers of his own and other Churches who had gathered together from different directions, to offer their last testimonies of regard and affection for the private character and public services of the deceased. "It was," says Dr. Hutter, "a truly solemn occasion, and many were the hearts that heaved with sadness, and the eyes that were suffused with tears." As busy memory recalled the reminiscences of the past, all

present seemed to realize that a great man had fallen in Israel. The sad scene was improved by appropriate exercises, in which Rev. Drs. Ziegler, Hutter, McCron and Martin participated.

Dr. Kurtz was thrice married. His first wife was Ann Barnett, of Washington County, Md.; his second, Mary Catharine Baker, of Winchester, Va.; his third, Mary Colhoun, of Chambersburg, Pa. He was the father of eleven children; five of these, three sons and two daughters, are still living.

Dr. Kurtz was unquestionably a man of great ability. He possessed an intellect of no common order, a resolute will, and remarkable personal power. His talents were versatile. His mind was original, quick and comprehensive. He was an active, vigorous thinker. He had acquired habits of close application, of careful and keen observation, a fondness for analytical research and the investigation of intricate questions. He had a clear, logical mind, and was very successful in his expositions of the truth. He loved discussion and seemed to be in his element when engaged in some controversy. He had mingled much with the world, and understood human nature. Common sense was the staple of his mind. His reading was extensive, and he had carefully improved his opportunities for mental culture. He readily comprehended a subject and knew how to grapple with any truth that claimed his attention. With those who could appreciate the force of argument and weigh testimony, he was most potent, and no man in the Lutheran Church ever exerted an influence, such as he did, with his pen, or his voice. Had he entered the legal profession, for which he was originally intended, or political life, to which he seemed so well adapted, he would, no doubt, have risen to the highest position, to a rank equal to his most distinguished cotemporaries. In any sphere of action to which he would have devoted himself, he could not have failed of success. The honorary degree of D. D., was conferred upon him by Washington College, Pa., in the year 1838, and that of LL. D. by Wittenberg College, Ohio, at its *Commencement* in 1858.

As a preacher, Dr. Kurtz possessed pre-eminent gifts. In his earlier years, and in the maturity of his strength, he was regarded by many as the most eloquent speaker in the State of Maryland. He was plain, thoughtful, argu-

mentative and forcible. His manner was solemn and earnest, and when his mind kindled into a glow, evinced deep pathos. He knew how to touch the most tender and deepest chords. He gave utterance to the great truths of the gospel with an energy and an unction that carried conviction home to the hearer. His sermons abounded with sound religious instruction, so naturally arranged and so clearly expressed, that they were easily intelligible to the popular mind. Whilst his appeals were directed to the thoughtful, they were so simple that a child could understand them. He never preached without inculcating truth, directly fitted to lead men to repentance, or to build them up in the faith. His constant aim was to develop the great truths of the Bible, the grand scheme of Christian doctrine, to turn the individual away from himself, and to persuade him to accept a salvation wrought out for him through the merits of Christ. "The marked characteristics of his preaching," says Dr. Morris, "was his habit of addressing the conscience. This he did with rare directness and strong effect. His entire freedom from every species of religious cant, and his obvious sincerity and independence imparted peculiar force to his declamations. It was evident that he felt himself what he wanted others to feel." "He was," says Dr. Schmucker, "one of the most practical, evangelical and useful preachers of our Church, who on many occasions rose to the highest grades of eloquence." He could never make allowance for any thing like affectation in the pulpit. He despised cant at any time, but especially in connection with the presentation of God's Word. His views on the subject of sermonizing, it is said, differed from those usually adopted. He was severe in his criticisms, and whilst he was patient with beginners, provided they were simple and in earnest, he never excused a man who knew how to preach and did not reach the proper standard. He also preached with equal acceptance in the German language. He had studied it with great care and thoroughness in his youth, and was considered a proficient German scholar. He held the German in very high estimation. "I have ever been," he says, "an ardent admirer of the language, regarding it like the Greek, as self-existent, self-accumulative, infinitely flexible, singularly precise in defining the various modifications and slight shades of thought, copious without limit, vigor-

ous without a superior, and far better adapted to the pulpit than the English. I have accordingly often regretted, that even native Germans so often soil and insult their own magnificent language, by interpolating so many foreign words, from the Latin, Greek and French, for which there is no necessity, nor excuse."

Dr. Kurtz was always considered an efficient and successful Pastor. This position he filled for eighteen years. He is said to have been exceedingly happy in the sick room, in the inquiry meeting and in private religious conversation. He knew how to sympathize with the afflicted, he understood the wants of the awakened, he was able to speak the fitting word, to minister successfully to the spiritual condition of his people.

Dr. Kurtz's colloquial powers were more than ordinary. He was a man of æsthetic culture. His mind was quick and active. His speeches were terse and to the point. Great vivacity and remarkable versatility characterized his conversation. His genial humor, varied knowledge of men and books, his ample fund of information, so rich in facts and incidents, his skill in telling a story, his bland and graceful manners, rendered his society highly attractive. He was always heard with marked and earnest attention. In the most brilliant companies he excited an interest and always communicated instruction. "If his remarks, made without premeditation, in the family or social circle," says Dr. Morris, who was brought into frequent and the most intimate relations with him, "could be gathered up, they would form the most valuable monument of the character of his mind."

It was, however, more as an Editor that Dr. Kurtz acquired the commanding influence which he exercised in the Church. His editorial career was, perhaps, the most eventful period of his life. His paper was a power in the Church, and was most skilfully wielded, in the support of his own views on Church questions and Christian doctrine. His abilities as an Editor were of a high order. This was generally admitted, even by those who differed from him in opinion. He possessed a combination of qualities which admirably fitted him for the work. He was industrious and devoted to the vocation. He was interested in all its duties. A Lutheran from childhood, he was familiar with the history of the Church, and ever ready to defend it, when assailed. He was a clear, vigorous, prolific wri-

ter, skilful in repartee, pungent in rebuke, always self-composed and collected, a man of independent spirit, of resolute purpose, reckless in reference to public sentiment and indifferent as to what others might say of him. His mind was fond of excitement, and worked best when under its influence. He delighted in polemics, and most generally in controversies gained the advantage over his opponent. The *Lutheran Observer*, from 1833 to 1862, contains his deliverances on all subjects which, during that period, agitated the Church and the country.

Dr. Kurtz never concealed his opinions on any public topic. He gave unreserved and fearless expression to them so that no one could misapprehend his meaning. His views respecting subjects of interest in Church and State were known. In the maintenance of his theological position he was rigid and consistent. No one ever charged him with tergiversation. He had no sympathy with what is sometimes denominated the Symbolical school in the Church. The Symbolical Books he regarded, to use his own language, "simply as fair exhibitions by the Reformers of the cardinal truths of God's Word, *as they understood it.*" "As a lucid and honest presentation of revealed truth, as the Reformers apprehended it," he said, "they were of immense value. They are the productions of mighty and enlightened minds, and deserve to be read and re-read, to be pondered and studied, and held in high and lasting esteem." Baptism he regarded, not as an initiatory, but as a recognizing and ratifying sacrament, the sign and seal of the covenant of grace, by virtue of which the children of Christian parents are born into the Church, just as the children of citizens are born into the Republic. There is but one true living Church, comprehending all believers throughout the world. Their children are entitled to membership, not on account of their Baptism, but by virtue of their being included in the covenant of grace. Adults become members of the Church by conversion, while their Baptism, the sign and seal of the covenant, announces, formally ratifies and proclaims the fact. Being the sign and seal of the covenant, he thought that none but the children of Christian parents, themselves belonging to the covenant, should be baptized, unless some one who is a Christian, acts as a sponsor, pledging himself to bring up the child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. The Lord's Supper, he considered the sign and seal

of the covenant of salvation, by faith in Christ, giving the believing communicant a special assurance of his interest in the atonement, or of his title, through Christ, to all the blessings of redemption. He maintained that Christ was particularly present in the Supper by his Spirit, in the same manner in which he is present with his people when they meet to worship him in spirit and truth, but in a more intense and impressive degree. He regarded salvation by grace through faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ, as the great fundamental doctrine of the Sacred Scriptures, around which, as the grand centre, all the other doctrines of the Christian system revolve. He believed that "the fundamental doctrines of the Word are taught in the Augsburg Confession in a manner substantially correct." He seemed to have little predilection for Creeds. He said he loved to derive his doctrinal views immediately from the fountains of sacred truth. He had no fondness for ceremonies in religion, or ritualistic forms, but preferred a simple and unostentatious method of worship. He favored protracted meetings for prayer and preaching, special seasons for invoking the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the churches, active measures in the promotion of revivals of religion. There was, however, nothing in his composition, narrow or proscriptive. He was tolerant of the views of others, disposed to concede to them what he claimed for himself, and to fraternize with Christians of every name.

Dr. Kurtz was, at different periods, called to important positions in the Church. In 1833 he was invited to become Pastor of St. Matthew's Church, Philadelphia. In 1834, he was elected to a Professorship in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg, and subsequently to a Chair in Pennsylvania College. He was, also, urged to connect himself with three other Theological Seminaries in the Church, but in every instance he felt it his duty to decline the appointment.

Dr. Kurtz was, in the full sense of the term, a public man. "In his death," says Dr. Schmucker, "the Lutheran Church lost one of her oldest, most faithful and successful ministers, the General Synod one of her earliest, ablest and most constant defenders, and the cause of Protestantism and evangelical piety in our country, one of its most enlightened and fearless advocates." He was identified with all the interests of the Church, with every literary

project and benevolent enterprise that claimed the public attention. The first meeting of the General Synod was held in his congregation, at Hagerstown, and he participated in its deliberations. He was present, frequently as a delegate, at nearly every Convention, and was twice honored with the Presidency. He took an active part in the establishment of every Institution, connected with the General Synod, and was, for many years, the President of the Parent Education Society, and of the Home Missionary Society. He was, for more than thirty years, one of the Trustees of Pennsylvania College, and served, for some time, as President of the Board. He was one of the Founders of the Theological Seminary of the General Synod, and from its organization was almost constantly a member of the Board of Directors. It was his suggestion, it is said, that originated the enterprise. At a District Conference, held in Martinsburg, Va., in the Church, of which Rev. C. P. Krauth, Sr., was Pastor, composed of the brethren Kurtz, Krauth, F. Ruthrauff and Winter, then all young men, he proposed that a special meeting of the Maryland Synod be called, to consider the propriety of establishing a Theological Seminary. At this Conference, after the public services were concluded, a collection was taken up, the result of which was five dollars, the first funds contributed to this object. From so small a beginning did the Institution, which has been productive of so much good, arise.

In 1825, Dr. Kurtz was appointed by the General Synod to visit Europe for the purpose of soliciting funds and books for the contemplated Seminary. He was reluctant, at first, to undertake the mission. "Whom shall I get," he asked, "to take charge of my congregations, whilst I am absent?" He finally succeeds in making satisfactory arrangements with Rev. Messrs. Ruthrauff and Medtard for the supply of his pulpit, and leaves home in the spring of 1826. Numerous were the testimonials of personal regard he carried with him. The Governor of the State, Drs. G. Lochman, F. D. Schaeffer, J. D. Kurtz, prominent members of the Pennsylvania Synod, all gave him their kind and friendly influence. "The whole Church," said Dr. J. G. Schmucker, as they affectionately separated, "will be engaged in prayer for you, in the midst of your dangers, your difficulties and discouragements." During his seasons of depression, when far from home and kindred in a strange

land, this was his consolation, that "the whole Church was engaged in prayer for him," and that "God is the hearer and answerer of prayer." The two years of his absence were an important epoch in his own life; his mission was accompanied with the happiest results. At the very commencement of his efforts he was greatly aided by the warm sympathy and cordial coöperation of Rev. Dr. Twesten. He took a deep interest in the mission, and with the view of advancing its object, prepared and published a pamphlet with the following title: "Information respecting the contemplated Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, to be erected at Gettysburg, Pa., N. A. Free States; together with a translation of the *status* of the Seminary. By Dr. A. D. Ch. Twesten, Prof. of Theol. and Phil. in the University of Keil." "The General Synod," he says, "could not have selected a worthier man. Genuine piety and cultivated mind, fervent zeal for the prosperity of his Church, and unpretending modesty, are attributes that must secure for him the kind reception which, apart from his personality, we owe to a sister Church. They have won over to him all hearts in Keil, and we doubt not, they will make the same impression on every one who may become acquainted with him in the course of his journey." Everywhere he secured attention and the coöperation of warm friends in the prosecution of his work. "No private citizen," says Dr. Morris, "ever received more courteous treatment, and was admitted into higher society in Europe than Dr. Kurtz. The visit of a Lutheran minister from America who preached German, was in those days such a rarity, the object of his tour so new, his preaching was of a character so different from that to which they were accustomed, the information he communicated so fresh, his manner so unaffected and simple that he attracted immense crowds wherever he preached, and his society was sought by intelligent men of every class. More than one crowned head invited him to his palace, and many of the nobility tendered him their hospitality. Divines, professors, jurists, artists, soldiers, men of every grade of respectability courted his company, and plied him with numberless questions about that then little known, but wonderful, America." His mission was regarded as very successful. He secured in funds about twelve thousand dollars, and in books about six thousand volumes. But independently of

his collections, it was productive of good. It awakened reciprocity of feeling and effected a union of interest and coöperation of effort between our transatlantic brethren and the Church in this country, which had not existed since the times of the Halle Patriarchs. For a long period the bond of union was maintained, the correspondence was frequent and fraternal, the interchange of sentiment, mutual and cordial.

In a series of letters from his pen, published, at the time, in the *Lutheran Intelligencer*, Dr. Kurtz furnishes many interesting incidents and reminiscences, connected with his foreign tour. He tells us that on his first arrival in Liverpool he was most kindly received by Rev. Dr. Raffles, Pastor of the Independent Church in that city. Several times he preached for him as well as for other dissenting ministers. But his first experience in London was not quite so pleasant. The Rev. Dr. Steinkopff, Pastor of the German Lutheran Church, and others to whom he had letters of introduction, were absent from the city. He was a stranger in a foreign land without friends. The bill of exchange which he had forwarded from Liverpool to a large Banking House, was dishonored, because the House in New York had no funds in London. He could find no one willing to make any advances for him. He was absolutely compelled to occupy a small garret in a remote street, where he and another poor fellow lodged in the same miserable apartment. His breakfast was literally a crust of bread and a cup of cold water. His wardrobe needed replenishing, his clothes were giving evidence of the service they had rendered. Depressed in spirits, he loitered through the streets of the great metropolis in a condition of mind more readily imagined than described. One day, as he was wandering along, hungry, sick and sad, he observed a large multitude gathering into some public edifice. He was told that the occasion of this great interest was the anniversary of the Sunday School Union. With the view of diverting his thoughts from his sufferings, he followed the immense crowd. His first attempts to gain an entrance into the building were fruitless. But through the assistance of the beadle, on ascertaining that the stranger was a minister of the gospel from the United States, he succeeded in securing a seat on the platform among some forty, or more, clergymen, and men of eminent rank. He was recognized as a minister, and was

requested to offer a resolution and make an address. To this, after some hesitation, he consented. The bursts of applause with which he was greeted, and the frequent expressions, "Hear him," "Hear him," sounded strangely to his American ears. Yet the apparent favor with which his effort was received, revived his spirits, and enabled him to speak with greater comfort to himself and increased effect. After the exercises were ended, he was invited by a wealthy gentleman to his house, who generously entertained him, furnished him with funds and presented him with a full and handsome suit of clothes. He always regarded this little episode as an interposition of a kind Providence, and gratefully remembered the parting words of his father in the ministry, that "the whole Church was engaged in prayer for him." At every point the Doctor made friends and excited an interest in his mission. He preached to large audiences, sometimes there were as many as five thousand persons present. The royal permission to solicit contributions was granted, and the object was everywhere received with favor. In Berlin, the Duke of Cumberland, a son of George III, of Great Britain, who, with his wife, a German princess, was then a resident of the city, bestowed upon him the most marked attentions. He even invited him to preach in his chapel, and after the services, his Royal Highness, who was a bluff Englishman, said: "I thank you, Mr. Kurtz. I like that sort of preaching. It comes to the point. These German preachers talk a great deal, but they say nothing. They do not lay hold of a man's conscience. It is all philosophy. Your preaching sir, I like!" He subsequently made him a present and gave him a testimonial, expressive of his own and the Princess' high approval and cordial esteem. Unsolicited he, also, wrote for him a letter of introduction to his royal brother, the Duke of Cambridge, the Governor-General of the kingdom of Hanover, who, likewise, gave him a very kind reception and many marks of favor. The King of Württemberg, also, manifested a deep interest in his visit and treated him with great consideration. Many were the inquiries propounded by his foreign acquaintances in reference to the ecclesiastical and political affairs of the United States, which they did not seem to be able to comprehend. The Doctor gives us some very amusing incidents respecting his violations of social conventionalities, the blunders he committed, his great ignorance of

German etiquette. On a particular occasion he was engaged to dine with a prominent merchant, in the city of Berlin. In the meantime an officer from the palace called upon him with an invitation from the King for dinner, on the same day. He, without any hesitation, told the liveried messenger that he was elsewhere engaged, and must decline the kind invitation. The servant was amazed, and said that he could not carry such a message to his Majesty. The simple-hearted American did not know, that the word of the King is regarded as supreme, and that no previous engagement is binding, when his royal orders are issued. The King, however, when he received the reply, was not displeased. He was rather gratified, and remarked: "Mr. Kurtz is, at least, an honest man, who could not violate his word, or break his promise, even for a King. At another time, when introduced to a woman of high position, she, as an evidence of her great respect and extraordinary condescension, extended to him her hand with the palm downward. The Doctor took it, and gave it a cordial grasp, but there was no reciprocity manifested; there was rather a repulsive expression of countenance, and an effort made to be released from the hold. All that she had designed was, that he should enjoy the illustrious honor of kissing her hand, and it almost threw her into spasms, when he gave it so firm an American shake.

In the year 1846, Dr. Kurtz re-visited Europe. In company with Drs. Schmucker and Morris, he was chosen to represent the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in this country, at the Convention of the Christian Alliance, held in London. On this occasion he made the tour of Germany, also of Switzerland and Scotland, and was absent from this country about seven months. It was pleasant to him to return to the scenes of his former visit, and to revive the reminiscences of the past. Every where he was received with kindness, and was brought into personal relations with many prominent individuals in the Church. He returned greatly improved in health, and resumed his editorial labors with renewed vigor and increased usefulness. During his absence, on this occasion, he also furnished an interesting series of letters for publication in the *Lutheran Observer*.

The last enterprise for the Church which engaged the attention of Dr. Kurtz, was the "Missionary Institute,"

designed for the "education of pious and sound-minded men, irrespective of age or domestic ties, for the office of the holy ministry in the Evangelical Lutheran Church, including the mission field, at home and abroad," to introduce into the ministry an increase of practical power, a class of men with less preparatory training, whose services, he supposed, the Church required. "He had a strong desire," says Dr. Hutter, "to found an Institution, in which men of more limited capacity and means, and somewhat more advanced in years, than are usually gathered into the other Schools of the Prophets, could be prepared for the gospel ministry. He felt persuaded that men of less scholastic attainments than are often made the standard of graduation at the higher class of Institutions, could be here equipped and sent forth, and prove mighty, through God, to the pulling down of the strong holds of sin and Satan." He never intended that the Institute should be antagonistic to the highest culture in the ministry. He deprecated the idea of any encroachment upon the interests of theological learning, or any interference with existing Theological Seminaries. He bore the highest testimony to the vast importance of a highly educated ministry, yet he maintained that men could become eminently useful and effective in the work with a less protracted course of study. The "Missionary Institute," he said, "contemplated a system less expensive than other Institutions in the Church, and more expeditious and productive in preparing men to preach the gospel to every creature." He was chosen, at its organization, Superintendent and Professor in the Institution, and for a time delivered a series of Lectures to the students. He continued his official connection with the School until the end, and was deeply interested in its prosperity. He never doubted the expediency of its establishment, and to the advancement of its interests he gave his earnest efforts and his best thoughts.

Dr. Kurtz was a man of strongly marked features. "No one," says Dr. Diehl, "would ever have taken him for an ordinary type of character. Keeness, vigor and force were portrayed in his countenance." He was a man of fixed determination and resolute will. Earnest and heroic, difficulties only stimulated him to greater exertions, opposition quickened his energies to higher activity. Nothing ever appalled him, or diverted him from a purpose, once taken. The strength of his convictions, and his boldness

ness in their defence, always made him a formidable opponent. He was a man of undaunted courage and independent spirit. He formed his opinions for himself, and avowed them with a fearlessness that regarded no antagonist. He never concealed his sentiments, he never evaded responsibility, he never compromised the truth. He was willing to encounter persecution, and to suffer reproach, rather than sacrifice principle, and to swerve from that which he believed to be right. He valued freedom of thought and liberty of speech, and was not disposed to surrender them for any consideration.

He was laborious, self-sacrificing, earnest, a man of great industry and unwearied perseverance, never yielding to any obstacle that was not absolutely insuperable. He was always employed. Notwithstanding his daily routine of duty, and the multiplicity of his engagements, he found some time for authorship. His books were generally well received by the public; some of them passed through several editions *

Dr. Kurtz possessed tender sensibilities. He had a warm, kind heart, and if in his manners he was less demonstrative than some others, he never repelled. "He was

* The following embraces a list of Dr. Kurtz's publications: First Principles of Religion for Children, Hagerstown, 1821: Sermons on Sabbath Schools, Hagerstown, 1822: Faith, Hope and Charity Hagerstown, 1823: Address on Temperance, 1824: Pastoral Address during his absence in Europe, 1827: Ministerial Appeal, Valedictory Sermon, Hagerstown, 1831: A Door opened of the Lord, Introductory Sermon, Chambersburg, 1831: Infant Baptism and Affusion, with Essays on Related Subjects, Baltimore, 1840: The Year Book of the Reformation, co-editor, 1844: Theological Sketch Book, or Skeletons of Sermons, carefully arranged in systematic order, so as to constitute a complete Body of Divinity, partly original, partly selected. 2 vols. Baltimore, 1844: Why are you a Lutheran? Or a Series of Dissertations explanatory of the Doctrines, Government, Discipline, Liturgical Economy, Distinctive Traits, &c. of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. Baltimore, 1847: Prayer in all its forms and Training of Children. Baltimore, 1856: Lutheran Prayer Book, for the use of families and individuals. Baltimore, 1856: The Serial Catechism, or Progressive Instruction for Children. Baltimore, 1848: Inaugural Address, setting forth the design, necessity and adaptation of the Missionary Institute at Selinsgrove, Pa. Baltimore, 1859: The Choice of a wife, Lecture to the Graduating Class of Theological Students in the Missionary Institute. Baltimore, 1863: The Condemned Sermon, Experimental, not Ritual Religion, the One thing Needful, Sermon delivered in Newville, Pa., before the West Pennsylvania Synod. Baltimore, 1863: Believers belong to Christ, Sermon preached before the Maryland Synod on a Sacramental Occasion. Baltimore, 1865.

not so stern a man," says Dr. Hay, "as some, who were less intimately acquainted with him, and who saw him only, it may be, under peculiarly unfavorable circumstances, supposed. He was genial and kind-hearted, and often manifested these traits of character, even when under the influence of physical suffering." Few men had the power of attaching individuals more strongly than he, or to bind more tenderly to his own heart, the hearts of devoted, loving friends. He never betrayed the interests of those whose confidence he enjoyed. He loved good men of every name, and met them with an open, catholic cordiality. He possessed great charity and knew how to exercise Christian forbearance.

He was a man of lofty patriotism. Deeply interested in his country, he loved its principles and honored its institutions. He studied its politics, he comprehended its position. He did not sympathize with human bondage, so long dominant in this favored country, and at the very commencement of our national difficulties, confidently predicted that the civil conflict, which was convulsing the land, would result in the removal of slavery. He rejoiced that he was permitted to witness its overthrow, the sacredness of the Union vindicated and its integrity preserved, the return of peace and the triumph of the right. During the dread struggle, the terrible ordeal through which, as a nation, we were called to pass, his trumpet gave no uncertain sound. He took an open and decided position while the startling events of the war were in progress, and did all in his power to meet the crisis with the noble courage, of faith, to sustain the authorities in the effort to crush the conspiracy, to defeat the machinations of men, insane with reckless ambition, who were endeavoring to overturn the freest and the best Government, God ever gave to the world.

The last time we met the Doctor, was just one year ago, at this season of the year, only a few weeks before his death. Unable to lie down, on account of a difficulty in respiration, he was sitting in his bed supported by pillows, apparently very near his end. Though suffering from disease, we found him patient and uncomplaining, gentle, calm and full of the anticipations of heaven. He was in a most comfortable frame of mind. Although the effort appeared painful, and he could articulate only in a whisper, yet he was anxious to speak. He said that he was

waiting for the Saviour—if he would only come and take him; that he was just at the gate, but the Lord was not yet ready to open it for him. It was his will that he should remain a little longer on the earth, and that he was entirely resigned to that will. He spoke of his own unworthiness, of his righteousness as “filthy rags;” Christ was his only ground of acceptance. “I have nothing,” he said “but Christ to depend upon—his robe of righteousness is my only hope. I have been most unworthy and sinful. I have done nothing—Christ has done all, through his blood alone I hope to be saved. I am a sinner saved by grace. My work on earth is done—through Christ I hope to get to heaven.” He spoke with great tenderness and gratitude of the kindness of his friends, and added, that special grace had been given him to forgive his enemies, to love them. He also referred, on this occasion, to his position on various questions; he had re-examined them in view of eternity, and had seen no reason to change them; but he had often been misunderstood, and his opinions misrepresented. He spoke particularly of two subjects—his defence of revivals and his connection with the Missionary Institute. In reference to the former, he said: “I have always been opposed to extravagance and disorder,” and in reference to the latter: “I was never hostile to an educated ministry. The Church must have ministers of thorough education and learning. But many can do good in the waste places of the Church, if their culture is not so extensive, if their hearts are only right, if they are only in earnest.”

In reviewing the life and services of the subject of the present narrative, we do not mean to say that he was free from imperfections. He was human, equally fallible with ourselves. There has been only one perfect being on earth. There is no man living that sinneth not.

*Nam vitiis sine nascitur: optimus ille est,
Qui minimis urgetur.*

There were defects, as well as excellencies, in his character. He had his infirmities and short-comings. He confessed and lamented them, but those who knew him best, were convinced that he was under the influence of Christian principle, that religion was the controlling motive, the supreme joy of his life. But whatever his failings were, whilst living, they are now all effaced. We can think of

him only as a perfect person in Christ Jesus, ransomed from the power of sin, and happy among the redeemed, in that land, where all is love and joy and peace—

"Who having run
The bounds of man's appointed years, at last,
Life's blessings all enjoyed, life's labors done,
Serenely to his final rest has passed."

Beyond the reach of human praise, or human censure, he quietly sleeps in the "house appointed for all the living." He rests from his long and faithful labors. He was one of those, to whom the inspired seer, looking through the veil of time into eternity, referred in the immortal words: "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labors, and their works do follow them."

ARTICLE III.

BAPTISMAL REGENERATION.

By Prof. D. WORLEY, A. M., Canton, O.

As important as the doctrine of "Justification by Faith," opposed to the Romish doctrine of justification by faith and works, confessedly is to the purity and safety of the Church, no less important is the doctrine of the means of grace, as opposed to the sectarian perversion by which faith is essentially stripped of its true character and power as a product of grace and treated as an element of human intellect only, called into exercise, it may be, by the Word of God addressed to the understanding and will. This latter doctrine is more pernicious in its tendencies and effects, in our day, than the former error of the Papacy; for while this brings in our feeble and imperfect works as co-operating in the work of justification, it still, in theory at least, gives large room for faith as a product of divine grace; that makes faith itself a human work, whilst it indirectly denies the doctrine of total depravity, and is the first step in the system of rationalism and infidelity. No

truth is more potently and continually urged in the Scriptures, than that of the total depravity of human nature ; or that "since the fall of Adam, all men who are naturally born, are begotten and born in sin ; that is, that they are from the first moment of their existence full of evil desires and propensities, and can have no true fear of God, no true faith in God, of their own accord."* The Psalmist says, Ps. 51 : 5 : "Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me." He also prays, Ps. 5 : 10 : "Create in me a clean heart, O God ; and renew a right spirit within me." Our Saviour says, John 3 : 6 : "That which is born of the flesh is flesh," and upon this bases the necessity, "Ye must be born again." St. Paul affirms, as it had been aforetime written, Rom. 3 : 10—12 : "There is none righteous, no, not one ; there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way ; they are together become unprofitable ; there is none that doeth good, no, not one."

And when man, honestly desirous of knowing himself, comes, under self-examination, to the light of the Word of God, how perfectly he sees himself, his own heart, human nature generally reflected in these and other teachings of the divine Word. Without it, man is in darkness and gloom, an enigma to himself ; but by it, and in it, through the gracious guidance and power of the Holy Ghost, he attains unto that highest of all knowledge, self-knowledge, and sees a solution of all the woes and sorrows of our sin-cursed humanity. The unborn child has the root of all evil already seated in his innermost being ; he is born into the world a child of the devil, and the very first visible manifestation of itself which every child shows, is that of a spirit controlled and influenced by the resistless power of evil and sin. The growing child is only a growing sinner, in whom the seeds of corruption develop and grow and perfect themselves in the fruits of death, temporal and eternal. Hence it is well declared : "Man is dead in trespasses and sins." To be dead in sin, is to be prone to every evil, and averse to every good ; it is to be estranged from God, and from the life of God, and subject to Satan and the life of sin ; it is to be completely sold under sin, and utterly powerless for righteousness and holiness : its

* Augs. Conf., Art. 2.

consequence is complete alienation from God and all good, and evil in body, mind and soul, under the sufferings and woe of everlasting death. And as God is, and must necessarily ever remain, holy and just, and can, therefore, have no pleasure in sin or the sinner, man, left to himself in this condition, is hopelessly the subject of God's eternal and righteous wrath and indignation. He must be changed; he must be renovated in his entire being; he must become a new creature, or be lost forever and ever. But can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Neither can man deliver himself from corruption and death. God, by his almighty wisdom and power alone can do it. And he, moved by infinite compassion and goodness, has provided that, as all in Adam die, so all in Christ shall be made alive. 1 Cor. 15 : 22. Sin must be atoned, and the sinner must be redeemed; righteousness acceptable unto God, must be provided, and man in this righteousness become holy, before he can be delivered from the power and evils of sin. The sufficient atonement, and sanctification have been provided and wrought out by God, through his only Son, our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. For man's sake, he took upon himself our human nature, and was made in all things, except sin, one with us; he raised our humanity up into his own divinity, and was himself God manifest in the flesh. By his death and sufferings, the just for the unjust, an all-sufficient ransom has been paid; by his obedience even unto death, the cruel and shameful death of the cross, he, the God-man, has provided a complete and spotless righteousness for all mankind. It needs only that this redemption and holiness be appropriated *unto* man that the work of salvation may be completed *in* man.

It is this appropriation of the suffering and merit of Christ, which claims our particular consideration; its importance is apparent from what has been already said. It remains for us to inquire earnestly, through the enlightening influence of the Spirit in the Word, through what means God is pleased to make of us new creatures in Jesus Christ. The successful physician when about to treat a case of serious illness, must not only understand the nature of the disease, but must adapt his remedies to all the circumstances of the patient. So God, in his tender compassion toward man, has humbled himself for man's relief to all the necessities of his low and desperate condition.

Hence the ordaining of means, through which the grace of God comes to appropriate salvation unto man; means which are simple in themselves, easy of attainment, and everywhere to be found. Man, as we have seen, is totally depraved and, of himself, cannot believe in, or come to, Jesus Christ; hence God comes to man, and, through means appropriate to his condition, bestows upon him the power of faith and of a new being unto justification and salvation; as it is written: "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God." Eph. 2 : 8. Faith is the power of the new man, created within us by the power and word of God; and this new man is none other than our Lord Jesus Christ himself. "For we are his workmanship, created in Jesus Christ unto good works." Eph. 2 : 10. Christ, who declared to Nicodemus the necessity of the new birth, also declared the means, and the power, through which it is accomplished: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." John 3 : 5. From the view we have already taken of man, and from all the requirements of his case, it is very evident that the birth of water and of the Spirit, cannot take place otherwise than as God himself appoints; it is also evident, that man's judgment of the propriety or sufficiency of his declarations and appointments, can neither confirm nor destroy their efficiency. Means of grace are efficacious to man, when used as God has given them, in his name and under his promise, simply and alone because God has seen proper to appoint them and has sanctioned them by the promise of his grace, which he has himself affixed to them.

When, then, we are led to inquire, What is Baptism, and what are its benefits? Our answer is: "Baptism is not mere water; but it is that water which the ordinance of God enjoins, and which is connected with God's Word; and it causes the forgiveness of sin, delivers from death and the devil, and gives everlasting salvation to those who believe; as the Word and promise of God declare."* The Church does not teach, and never has taught, that Baptism is regeneration; but she does teach, and in accordance with the Word of God must teach, that through Baptism grace is offered, and that in all those who allow the work

Luther's Smaller Catechism, IV.

VOL. XVIII. No. 69. 7

of grace to commence and grow in their hearts, not resisting the Holy Spirit in Baptism, but in humble trust to God's promise affixed unto Baptism, allowing him to renew, transform and sanctify the heart, it is a means of God unto regeneration and the new birth of the Spirit, and secures in these the forgiveness of sin, life, and salvation. God comes in holy Baptism, which is his own appointment and does not rest upon any foundation of man's laying, and offers grace, his own grace in Jesus Christ, unto all; they who by faith receive what God thus gives them freely, without money, without price, and without any merit in themselves, have what is therein offered them, for the word and promise of God cannot, and will not, in any case, fail of accomplishment.

In the new birth, regeneration, strictly considered, sustains the same relation that generation does to the natural birth. It is the implanting of the seed of the new man within us, which seed, in accordance with God's arrangement and appointment, must, in a dependent condition, develop and grow in our connection with the Church, the bride of Christ, and our common mother, until in God's own good time, and according to the working of his good pleasure, as declared in the Word, we are perfected in the new man, and delivered into the more independent state of existence, which is that of the saints in glory. In thus accepting the doctrine of regeneration and tracing it to, and from, the grace of God offered unto man in holy Baptism, and accepted and appropriated by man in faith, we avoid two very prevalent extremes of error, that which would make Baptism, by the mere act, and independent of faith, effective unto regeneration; and that, on the other extreme, which makes faith as an exercise of the human understanding, independent of the intermediate grace given and secured in Baptism, and by implication, more effective than even the word and promise of God. Both these errors agree in this, that they make more allowance for the human work than they do for the grace of God in regeneration and justification. The true ground of doctrine is here, as in many other things, just between the two extremes. It is, therefore, important, that we establish our position upon the infallible teachings of God's Word; for the truth established upon these is secure, and will not be in any danger from error, under whatever form, and from whatever quarter the attack may come.

Nor must we mistake the hallucinations of disordered fancy for the Word of God. Neither when we have a sure word for our positions, dare we reject it, because of the weakness or perversity of our darkened human understanding. The Word of God in itself, without any addition or subtraction from man, must determine our faith, if we would have it rest upon a sure foundation. Hence, however consoling the doctrine of Baptism may be to us poor sinners, who knowing our insufficiency, look to the sufficiency of God's grace offered therein, we must look for the ground of our hope to what God has most solemnly declared and taught concerning Baptism as a means of grace.

We have already adverted to the necessity of a new birth of water and the Spirit, as declared to Nicodemus, by our Saviour himself; that Holy Baptism is thus presented as the means, and the Holy Spirit as the agent of the new birth, may be clearly seen from the following considerations: Man must be born of water and the Holy Ghost, before he can enter into the kingdom of heaven; as the work of the new birth implies creative power, and man himself is dead to all that is good, it can only be accomplished by the power of God; man can not expect the power of God to be exerted on his behalf otherwise than as he declares and appoints; there is not a single appointment of God's Word, except Baptism, in which water is connected with the Spirit in the work of salvation; hence there can be no other ordinance substituted for Baptism by men, to attain the purpose which is expressly confined to it. Again; when we come to compare Scripture with Scripture, the evidence of the Word is positive and conclusive, that the birth of water and the Spirit is none other than the act of the Holy Ghost in Holy Baptism, appropriating Christ, with all his merits and sufficiency to him that believes. Christ declares to Nicodemus that to enter into the kingdom of God, i. e., to be saved, man must be born of water and the Spirit; on the day of Pentecost when, by the preaching of Peter and the other apostles, the multitudes convinced of sin, began eagerly to inquire, "What must we do?" The answer is: "Repent and be baptised every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Acts 2:38. Paul says to Titus, 3:5; "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but

according to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost." Now can any thing be plainer than that the birth of water and the Spirit as used by Christ, the being baptized in the name of Christ, and receiving the gift of the Holy Ghost, as directed by Peter; and the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, as used by Paul must refer to one and the same thing: on the one hand we have water, baptism, and washing of regeneration, connected on the other with the Holy Ghost to secure our entrance into the kingdom of God, remission of sins, or salvation; What else can be said than this; Baptism is the washing of regeneration, converting man by the renewing of the Holy Ghost through this birth of Water and the Spirit, to Christ for the remission of sin, life and salvation? Or, as the Apostle says, Col. 2 : 9—13 : For in him, viz.: Christ, dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily. And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power; in whom, also, ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ; buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him, through faith of the operation of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath he quickened together with him, having forgiven you all trespasses:" which words show us that in Baptism they, who through faith receive the grace therein offered, are united with Christ in the power of his death and resurrection, are quickened or regenerated with him, and receive the forgiveness of sins. Already in the olden times, before the advent of Jesus into the world, the holy prophet of God, looking forward in the spirit of prophecy to the glory of the Redeemer's kingdom, declared the voice of God: "I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean; from all your filthiness, and from all your idols, will I cleanse you. A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you: and I will take away the stony heart out of your flesh, and I will give you a heart of flesh." Ezek 36 : 25, 26. Christ commanded to preach the gospel to all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Triune God, and promised salvation to all who believed and were baptized. Mark 15 : 15, 16. The Apostle Peter declares, referring to the saving of Noah

and his family, by water in the ark, that in like manner, "even Baptism doth now save us, (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh," *i. e.*, a mere washing of the body, "but the answer of a good conscience towards God," *i. e.*, through the inner washing of the soul,) "by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." 1 Peter 3 : 20, 21. By nature we are the children of the devil: to enter into God's kingdom and to be saved, we must become the children of God. Paul tells us how this is accomplished. "You are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ." Gal. 3 : 26, 27. "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ were baptized into his death." Rom. 6 : 3. Paul himself had been thus commanded of the Lord by his servant, Ananias: "Arise and be baptized and wash away thy sins," Acts 22 : 16, and he knew by the evidence of the Spirit of God, the efficacy of Baptism in securing the peace of God, through faith, in the forgiveness of sin, and participation in the new life of Jesus Christ, and he could therefore speak of the virtue of Baptism, not as one who doubted, but as one who, through faith, knew what he declared. Shall we, dare we, hearkening to the seductive voice of our own deceitful and depraved understanding, reject his testimony, and, through false interpretations, deprive the Word of God of its power in our unbelief? It will, nevertheless, still retain its power; for though in its rejection by us, the Word of God will not be unto us a source of life unto life, it will seal our condemnation. God has ordained holy Baptism; in it he enters into covenant relations with us and makes us his children; but if we reject his proffered grace, and do not receive him in the appointments of his Word, as he comes unto us, we will, with unbelieving Jews, be cut off from the living vine, into which we have been engrafted; and our condemnation will be sure.

It remains, then, for us to inquire how we may retain the grace of God which is given us in Baptism. The seed that is cast into the ground must receive its due proportion of heat and light and moisture, before it will germinate and grow into a living, fruit-yielding plant. If these are withheld, it will either remain torpid, or in time die entirely. In natural birth, too, generation is not all; the embryo-child is connected with its mother, and must be supplied with its appropriate nourishment, that it may

grow and develop into a full-formed and perfect being before birth is finally accomplished; if not supplied according to the essential condition of its being, the embryo, at any stage of its development, may be destroyed, or birth end in a lifeless, shapeless mass. And so it is in the new birth. In Baptism grace is secured and the Holy Spirit renewed unto man; but by the appointment of God, certain essential conditions of growth and development are affixed to the new man, regenerated within us by the power of the Holy Ghost. In subjection to these conditions it will grow and develop—deprived of them, we have no right to expect it. The plant of life within us requires the watering of the Word, and the new man must grow up into perfection in the union of our Lord Jesus Christ. That these conditions may be secured for the child of God, he has ordered and arranged his holy Church, and committed to her the office of the keys, in the preaching of the gospel and the administration of the sacraments. It is in the preaching of the Word and in the Lord's Supper, that Christ has made provision to refresh and feed his children, begotten again of him unto eternal life. Under the preaching of the pure Word and in the Holy Supper, administered according to the Word, the believer in self-examination, daily repentance, and sorrow for sin, and daily trust and confidence in God and his holy promises, renews his strength, finds power and grace to resist the flesh, the world and the devil, and gains at last an enduring and eternal victory over them. For thus by the growth of the new man in them, they grow up into Christ; they live in him, and he lives in them. Thus the grace of Baptism retains its power from day to day, and we develop and become fruitful plants in the garden of the Lord, living, active, zealous Christians in his Church. And so it will continue to be, so long as we do not withdraw ourselves from the Holy Spirit's influence in the means of God's appointment: but if we do reject the means of grace, forsake the preaching of the gospel, and refuse to come to the table of the Lord and feast upon his body, broken for our sins, and his blood, spilled on our behalf, then we remove ourselves from the Spirit's influence, and the seed of grace cannot, and will not, grow in our hearts; and if we continue in our rejection of the Spirit in the means given and ordained of God, we shall grieve him away, and that seed of grace will die; the life of God in Christ Jesus will

be taken from us; God will give us over to hardness of heart; and we shall perish without remedy. Let the example of the Jews, once the accepted and covenant people of the Lord, stand before us, as an admonition against unfaithfulness to the covenant relations, which through Baptism, we sustain to God. "Because of unbelief they were broken off and thou standest by faith. Be not high-minded, but fear. For if God spared not the native branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee." Rom. 11 : 20, 21.

If the question should yet be asked, How can these things be; how can Baptism, and the Word, and the Lord's Supper accomplish the great and necessary blessings upon man, let Christ's answer to Nicodemus suffice us: "Marvel not that I said unto thee, ye must be born again. The wind bloweth where it listeth and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh and whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit." John 3 : 7, 8. The operations of the Spirit in the means of grace do not depend upon man's understanding; their efficiency and sufficiency rest upon the wisdom and power and promises of God; we are not required to understand them; we walk not by sight, but by faith; our faith does not rest upon any knowledge we have in ourselves, but upon the infallible and unchanging Word of God. Our redemption and salvation are a deep and hidden mystery of God, but to us who live by faith in Jesus Christ our Lord, a sacred and blessed mystery of grace and goodness, securing unto us present peace, hope in death, and acceptance at last with our Father, and the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Let us only be faithful in submission to the means of grace, using them humbly in prayer, praise and thanksgiving, and their power unto salvation will be secured unto us forever. *How*, in these things, is the suggestion of the devil; it is opening the gate for doubt, uncertainty, infidelity and death. Nicodemus asked it, but was not answered; the Jews asked it, and because they could not see, many left off following Christ. If, under the enlightenment of the divine Word, we consider the greatness of the work, required to justify and save the sinner; if we consider the vastness of the sacrifice required to atone for sin and to appease the holy and just wrath of God; if we look at the infinity of love which moved God to give his only begotten and well-beloved Son as this sacrifice, and as our righteousness, our finite understand-

ing will stand back abashed; and filled with wonder and amazement, we can only exclaim with the holy apostle when looking into these things: "Oh, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and his ways past finding out!" Rom. 11 : 33. There are a thousand mysteries in our earthly and temporal being, which have ever baffled all the efforts and the understanding of the wisest of the sons of men to unravel them; shall it be any wonder then that when God reveals his holy will with reference to our spiritual and eternal being, there should be a mystery, defying the finite, and weak, and sin-blinded reason of man? The fruits of the operation of God's word and law in nature, we see and may accept, even though we may not be able to understand them; in his spiritual kingdom if we submit to his appointments of grace, we will, too, without fail, experience the riches of his grace, without being able to answer the *hows* and the *wherefores* of an unbelieving heart. It is ours not to see now, but to believe and trust now, that we may see hereafter.

ARTICLE IV.

DR. SHEDD'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO ITS STATEMENTS IN REGARD TO THE CONFESSIONS AND DOCTRINES OF THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.*

By Prof. CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Philadelphia.

It cannot be claimed for Dr. Shedd's book that it is the profoundest and most exhaustive history of Christian doctrine, but it may be asserted with justice that it is eminently pleasant and readable. But if it be not as profound as is conceivable, it is as profound as its general aim permits it to be, and if it does not always exhaust its subjects, it never exhausts its readers. We cannot concede to Dr. Shedd all that he seems to claim, and we are sure with

* A History of Christian Doctrine. By William G. T. Shedd, D. D. In Two Volumes. New York: Charles Scribner.

perfect sincerity, in regard to the originality, or even the self-origination of his method. It varies so little from that of some of the German works to which he confesses his obligations, that without presupposing their plan we can hardly conceive that he would have fallen upon his. He investigates "each of the principal subjects by itself, starting from the first beginnings of scientific reflection upon it, and going down to the latest forms of statement." Dr. Shedd accepts, at the very out-start, the idea of doctrinal development, and one of the best features of his book and of its plan is, that he so clearly and satisfactorily exhibits the processes and results of this development. Revelation is unchanging, but the science which classifies, and adjusts in their due relations to each other its doctrines, which sees each in the light of all, and under whose guidance, to use the vigorous words of Dr. Shedd, "the objections of the heretic or latitudinarian only elicit a more exhaustive, and at the same time more guarded statement, which carries the Church still nearer to the substance of revelation and the heart of the mystery," this science, in its own nature, must have a growth. The man who takes up the Bible now, without reference to what the minds of generations have done towards its elucidation, is exactly as foolish as the man who would affect to be an astronomer, and who starting with the contemptuous repudiation of the human speculations of Newton and La Place, and the finite machinery of the telescope, would go out upon the hills at night, after the fashion of the Chaldean shepherds, to study, through the hole in his own blanket, the stars as God made them, with his own good eyes, which God also made, and not as astronomers, who are but men, have speculated about them, and not as telescopes, which are but the imperfect workmanship of the creature, seem to present them. Dr. Shedd has well stated and well guarded the doctrine of development. He shows that development is not creation, nor improvement. Astronomy neither creates the stars, nor improves upon the facts connected with them; but it develops into a more perfect knowledge of them, and out of that higher knowledge into a more perfect science. The facts of the stars are the rule of the astronomer's faith, but the Principia is its creed. The science develops, but it develops toward the absolute truth, not away from it; and the more perfect the doctrinal

development is, the nearer has it come to the ideal of God's mind, which has its image in his word.

Much of Dr. Shedd's mode of thinking is certainly not the outgrowth of anything characteristic of New England. The attitude of the original extreme Puritanism to the history of the ancient Church, was very different from his. Puritanism, as separatism, had no history for it, and hence it repudiated history. It has lived long enough to have a history, to recede from its extreme positions, and to receive new elements of life; and Dr. Shedd's book is one among many evidences that Puritanism seeks a history, and begins to appreciate its value — the value not only of its own history, but of the history of the whole Church. After all the diversities and terrible internal strifes of the nominally Christian Church, there is not any great part of it that can safely ignore absolutely any other great part. Puritanism cannot say, even to Romanism, "I have no need of thee," still less can it say so to the grand portions of evangelical Protestantism. Dr. Shedd's book shows that he has escaped from many of the narrownesses which obscured the genuine glory of Puritanism, for genuine glory it has, and a great deal of it. No book of which we know, emanating from a New England mind, shows as much acquaintance as this book does with the character and weight of Lutheran theology. We might wish, indeed, that some of the weak and foolish men, whose chief claim to be considered Lutherans is, that they know nothing of its doctrines, and exhibit none of its virtues, would seat themselves at the feet of this Puritan Doctor, and learn better things.

Nevertheless, one of the greatest weaknesses of the book is its lack of a thorough and independent knowledge of our Church. Dr. Shedd, especially in his exhibitions of the Patristic and English views, shows independent research; but in the treatment of the Lutheran theology he gives unmistakable evidence that his reading has been comparatively slight among the masters, especially the old masters of our Church. He has trusted too much to manuals, and yet has hardly used them enough. He exhibits views as characteristic of Calvinistic divines, or of the Calvinistic symbols, which are mere resonances of the Lutheran theology, whose glory it is, first to have brought into the distinct sphere of science the great Biblical truths of which we speak. The scientific development of the

doctrine of the redemptory character of the *active* obedience of Christ, is due to the Lutheran theologians. The true and profound views of the person of Christ, which Dr. Shedd presents in the language of Hooker and Hopkins, though involved in the Athanasian Creed, received their full scientific shape from the Christological labors and controversies of the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth century. The Lutheran Church has been the ultimate spring of almost all the profound theological thought of modern times. Even Calvinism, without it, would not have been. Calvin was saved, we might almost say created, by being first Lutheranized.

It is refreshing to find in Dr. Shedd's book so much that is sound, and deep, and old; but which will, to the mass of thinkers in New England, seem like novelty. Nothing, indeed, is so novel in New England as the old theology, in some of its aspects. How, for example, must the doctrine of the true sacramental presence mystify them? Dr. Shedd, perhaps wisely, has spared them this. There are, indeed, great departments of the history of doctrine, on which he does not enter. He gives us, for example, nothing direct on the doctrines of the Church, of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper; yet these involve many of the most vital questions of the hour. On the other hand, he has gone, we think, beyond the bond in devoting a whole book to the history of Apologetics, and another to an account of Symbols. He has done it so well, however, that we not only forgive him, but thank him for it.

One very interesting feature of the book is its presentation of many of the Calvinistic doctrines in their coincidence with the Lutheran; as, for instance, in the paragraphs on the "Lutheran-Calvinistic Theory of Original Sin," "The Lutheran-Calvinistic Theory of Regeneration;" and on other points. Dr. Shedd seems to fear that "the chief criticism that may be made upon the work is, that it betokens subjective qualities unduly for an historical production." On the contrary, we think, that so far as is consistent with fidelity to conviction, his book is remarkably free from the offensive obtrusion of merely personal opinions. There is not a page in it whose tone is unworthy of the refined candor of a Christian gentleman. We are struck, indeed, as we have said, with what we regard as mistakes in reference to the Lutheran Church, but the

statements of Dr. Shedd are made in a tone which relieves them of all asperity; and he knows so much more about our Church than most writers of English who have attempted to describe it, that we feel that his mistakes are involuntary. They are fewer than might have been anticipated. Dr. Shedd speaks of the Augsburg Confession as "the symbol which was to consolidate the new evangelical Church into one external unity, in opposition to that of Rome." "But the doctrines of sin and redemption had been mistated by the Papal mind at Trent; and hence the principal part of the new and original work of the Lutheran divine was connected with these." This collocation might mislead the reader, who forgets that the Augsburg Confession was prepared fifteen years before the first convention of the Council of Trent. Dr. Shedd speaks of the Augsburg Confession as "the first in time" among our symbols. Twelve pages after he corrects himself by mentioning that the Two Catechisms were published in 1529, a year before the Augsburg Confession. Dr. Shedd says appreciatively: "The general tone and spirit of the first creed of the Reformation is a union of firmness and mildness. The characteristics of Luther and Melancthon, the two minds most concerned in its formation, are harmoniously blended in it."

The Origin of the Augsburg Confession.

In Dr. Shedd's interesting volumes, we naturally look with most interest for that which bears upon our own Church. His remarks upon the origin, character and supposed imperfections of the Augsburg Confession, may require some examination. Dr. Shedd speaks of the Augsburg Confession as a public and received Confession of the common faith of the Protestant Church. Taking the word "Protestant" in its original and strictly historical sense, this is true, but it is not, nor was it ever the received Confession of all whom we now call "Protestants." Two counter Confessions, those of Zwingli and the Tetrapolitan, were prepared for the Diet of Augsburg. There are some defects too in Dr. Shedd's statement of the origin of the Confession. He says: "The process began with a commission from John, Prince of Saxony, given in March, 1530, to his favorite theologians, Luther, Justus Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melancthon, to prepare a series of succinct and comprehensive articles to be discussed and de-

fended as the Protestant form of doctrine." Dr. Shedd's statement in this sentence is defective, for it does not furnish the reason of this commission, and it seems inaccurate in making this commission the beginning of the process which was completed in the laying of the Confession before the Diet of Augsburg. The ultimate ground-work of the Augsburg Confession is the Fifteen Articles of Marburg which were the result of the conference between the Zwinglians and Lutherans, October, 1529. These are more closely related to the Seventeen Articles of Schwabach than the Schwabach Articles are to the Augsburg Confession. The real immediate beginning of the Process was in the summons of the Diet by the Emperor Charles V., dated January, 1530, in which he stated as one of the objects of the Diet, the comparison and harmonizing of the conflicting views which were dividing the Church, and to this end required of the evangelical princes a statement of their doctrine. The Elector of Saxony, the leader of the Evangelical States, foresaw that for any such comparison a clear and judicious statement in writing, both as to doctrines and abuses, would be necessary on the part of the Protestants, (Lutherans,) and gave the command to the four theologians, to prepare the needed statement, and present it to him in eight days at Torgau. The shortness of the time allotted is the solution of the fact, that "these theologians joined on upon the work that had already been performed by one of their number," though it is not strictly accurate to say that the work had been performed by one of their number, as Luther says, in so many words, in his Preface to these Articles, that they were not his exclusive work.* His co-laborers in preparing them were Melancthon, Jonas, Osiander, Brentius and Agricola. "In the preceding year, (1529,) Luther, at a Convention of Protestants, at Schwabach, had prepared seventeen Articles, to be adopted as the doctrinal bond of union. These Articles, this body of Commissioners appointed by Prince John adopted, and having added to their number some new ones that had respect to certain ecclesiastical abuses, presented the whole to the Crown Prince, in Torgau, in March, 1530. Hence, they are sometimes denominated the "*Articles of Torgau*." The reader must not suppose, as he might, that

*Sie sind nit von mir allein gestellet. The whole are given in Cyprian's Historia, (Gotha, 1730,) Beilage, p. 159. Corpus Reformatorium, xxvi. 138.

"Prince John" was one person, and "the Crown Prince" another. We do not know why Dr. Shedd prefers the title "Prince" to the more definite and historical term Elector, unless as a resident of New York, there is special music in his ear in the style and title of that old time pet of the Empire State, "Prince John" Van Buren. And why does he style the Elector the "Crown Prince?"

In the nomenclature of the best recent writers on the history of the Augsburg Confession, the title "Schwabach Articles" is confined to those of the 27th of October, 1529, and the name of "Torgau Article" is restricted to the Articles prepared by the four theologians at Wittenberg, March, 1530, and presented at Torgau. Dr Shedd goes on to say: "This draft of a Confession was then brought before the Imperial Diet, at Augsburg, for examination and adoption. Here it received revision, and some slight modifications, under the leadership of Melancthon, who was present at the discussion before the Diet, and was aided during the progress of the debate, by the advice and concurrence of Luther, then at Coburg, in a free and full correspondence. The symbol having been formed in this manner, was subscribed by the princes and authorities of the Protestant interest, and in their name publicly read in German, before the imperial assembly, and a copy, in both German and Latin, presented to the Emperor. The Augsburg Confession thus became the authorized doctrinal basis of Protestantism in Germany." In this account we are compelled to say there is more than one mistake. Neither this draft of a Confession, nor any other draft, was ever brought before the Imperial Diet, either for examination and adoption, or for any other purpose. Of course, therefore, it received no revision there, or modification. None of the processes connected with the formation of the Confession, took place in the presence of the Diet. The Diet knew nothing of its contents up to the time of the reading of it. After the Elector had received, at Torgau, the Schwabach, and the Torgau Articles proper, he started for Augsburg, leaving, for prudential reasons, Luther at Coburg, with the understanding that nothing final should be done without consulting him. The Elector and his retinue entered Augsburg, May 2nd, and remained there. During the rest of the month, and for the first half of June, the secular and ecclesiastical dignitaries were gathering for the Diet. In this interval, from May 26th to June 20th,

the Emperor not having arrived, and no sessions of the Diet having taken place, Melancthon, with the aid and advice of the other theologians, and of all the representatives of the Evangelical interest, given in, sentence by sentence, did the work of composing the Confession which was to be submitted to the Diet, laying as the groundwork, the Articles of Schwabach and Torgau, but doing far more than would be generally understood in Dr. Shedd's statement, that these Articles "received revision and some slight modifications." This Confession, when finished, was sent by the Elector to Luther, by whom, without a solitary change, or suggestion of a change, it was approved, May 15th, one month previous to the entrance of the Emperor into Augsburg. The first session of the Diet was held June 20th, and it was determined that the religious questions should be taken up first.

On the 23rd of June, the Protestant Princes signed the Confession. On the 24th they received permission to present the Confession on the following day. The material labor on the Augsburg Confession was finished and approved by Luther more than a month before the Diet met. In the intervening weeks, Melancthon elaborated the style, and gave higher finish to the form of the Confession, and before the Diet met, the Confession was finished. It was then no draft, but the perfect Confession, which was in the hands of the Confessors when the Diet met; but neither draft nor Confession was ever submitted for adoption to the Diet. It received, and could in the nature of the case receive, no revision or "slight modification before the Diet." Melancthon was not present at the discussion before the Diet, not only, although this would seem to be enough, because there was no such discussion, but he was not, in fact, present in the Diet at any discussions of any sort. Melancthon did not hear the Augsburg Confession read. Justus Jonas was the only evangelical theologian who heard the Confession read, an honor which may have been thought due to his juristic skill, or to his official position. There was no discussion of the Articles of the Confession before the Diet, and no debate in regard to them to make any progress, to be shared in by Melancthon, or to require the aid of Luther. The Symbol was not formed in this manner, as we have seen, but was finished before the Diet began. Equally mistaken is the statement, that Melancthon entered upon a detailed refu-

tation of the Romish Confutation, "so far as he could reconstruct the document from his own recollection on hearing it read," as he did not hear it read, and was at first entirely dependent on "notes that had been taken by others who were present at the reading." Dr. Shedd has evidently either been following very inaccurate guides, or, for some reason, has misunderstood his authorities on these points. His bibliography of the literature of the history of symbols does not, indeed, seem to indicate that he has made it a matter of very thorough study; for there is no mention made in it of works of the very highest rank, as, for example, of the works of Carpzov, Baumgarten, Boehmer and Semler, among the older writers; of Plank, Marheineke, Tittmann and Marsh, in the first quarter of the present century; of Möhler and Köllner, whose merits are of the most distinguished order; or of Matthes and Rudolph Hoffmann, and others, who, as good writers of the most recent date, deserve mention. The selectest bibliography ought to embrace all of these. The truth is, however, that the separate history of Symbols is not more properly in place in a history of doctrines, than a history of Polemics, of Patristics, or of Biblical Interpretation would be, for all these are, incidentally, sources of illustration of the history of doctrine. Each of them is, moreover, comprehensive enough for a distinct treatment. Dr. Shedd has made his plan too comprehensive, and necessarily renders it relatively weaker at certain points. The plan which Dr. Holmes has rendered so renowned, of making the weakest point in the chain as strong as the rest, is exquisite in theory, but difficult in practical realization.

The Augsburg Confession not Romanizing. Consubstantiation no Doctrine of our Church.

"The Augsburg Confession," says Dr. Shedd, "is divided into two parts: the one, positive and didactic in its contents; the other, negative and polemic." The Augsburg Confession as it is usually, and was most anciently divided, consists of the Preface, Chief Articles of Faith, The Articles on Abuses, and the Epilogue. Köllner makes a fifth part of the Epilodal Prologue, which separates and unites the articles on Doctrine and the articles on Abuses. Nevertheless, Dr. Shedd very properly divides it, in a general way, into two parts. The first of the chief

parts, however, in addition to its positive statements of doctrine, has negative antitheses on the doctrines of the Trinity, Original Sin, the Efficacy of the Ministry, Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Repentance, the Use of Sacraments, of Civil matters, the Second Coming of Christ, and Free Will. On a number of the points, arguments are urged, Scripture is quoted and patristic authorities appealed to, and in the Article on Good Works, the prevailing character is entirely Apologetic. The doctrine of good works had been stated in the sixth article, the twentieth is devoted to the defence of it.

Dr. Shedd exhibits the thoroughly catholic and evangelical character of the Augsburg Confession in regard to the Trinity, Sin, Salvation, and the Last Things. He goes on, however, to make some strictures on certain points, and says: "Though decidedly Protestant upon the cardinal points, the Augsburg Confession contains some remnants of that unscriptural system, against which it was such a powerful and earnest protest." It will be seen from the extract, that Dr. Shedd is theologically and virtually, an "American Lutheran," though nominally a Congregationalist. He admits, that upon the *cardinal doctrines*, the Augsburg Confession is Protestant and sound; indeed he goes further than many "American Lutherans," conceding it to be sound on points on which they regard it as erroneous. Moreover, like "American Lutherans," he maintains that this same Confession contains some remnants of Romanism. The Doctor, if he reads our Church papers, will find that he has already been quoted as a partisan of that portion of our communion in this country, which claims, like the Rationalists of Germany, and the Socinians of New England, the right to the historic name, as is done with that of Lutheran in one case, and of Congregationalist in the other, while they repudiate the doctrines and principles, which are forever associated with all honest use of the terms. He will, perhaps, be astonished to find that nothing gives him more favor among a portion of nominal Lutherans, than his unfavorable representations in regard to the doctrines for which our fathers, when need was, laid down their lives. Nevertheless, the sorrowful history of New England will remind him how the terms "liberal" and "charitable" were made to cover error; how "love" and "forbearance" have been converted

into an enginery against truth, and how the idea that men may call themselves what they are not, and may undermine the system with which they are ostensibly identified, may at last work itself out in open and soul-destroying heresy. Let him not imagine that the fact, that some nominal Lutherans may accept certain statements of his, in regard to our Church, as well-grounded is anything in their favor; on the contrary, they create a strong *a priori* presumption against their correctness—as there is nothing so odious to them as the truth, which convicts them of dishonesty to the noble name they bear, and of treachery to the great principles with which it is bound up forever.

We feel, however, one surprise in regard to Dr. Shedd, which we do not feel in regard to those of whom we speak. It is that, without their motive, he speaks of matters as of little moment, which we would have supposed he, as a Calvinist, would esteem as highly important. Is Dr. Shedd safe, for example, in conceding that the doctrines, concerning the Eucharistic presence and Absolution are not cardinal; for if the doctrines are not cardinal, the errors in regard to them, cannot be; on his premises, then, Transubstantiation itself is not a cardinal error, and the Romish doctrine of priestly absolution, is not a cardinal error. We as Evangelical (not "American,") Lutherans, hold that as error on these points is cardinal, so must the truth, in regard to them, be cardinal. Fundamental errors are the antitheses of fundamental truths only, and we Evangelical Lutherans, actually cherish, on Dr. Shedd's own showing, a stronger, and as he would, perhaps, regard it, an extremer opposition to the Romish errors on these points, than he does—we do regard the Romish errors on these doctrines as cardinal, but it seems he does not. He will find in our divines through centuries, this stern opposition to these very errors as cardinal, and among no men at this hour, is this feeling deeper, than among the most tenacious adherents to the Augsburg Confession. How does he account for it then, that under the nurture of this very Confession, which he supposes to be sympathetic with Romanism at some points, there has been nursed a deeper and more radical anti-Romish feeling, on these very doctrines, than his own?

Dr Shedd goes on to say: "These Popish elements are found in those portions particularly, which treat of the sacraments; and more particularly in that article which

defines the sacrament of the Supper. In Article XIII, the Augsburg Confession is careful to condemn the Popish theory, that the sacraments are efficacious, *ex opere operato*, that is, by their intrinsic efficacy, without regard to faith in the recipient, or to the operation of the Holy Spirit; but when, in Article X, it treats of the Lord's Supper, it teaches that 'the body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who partake of the Supper.' This doctrine of *Consubstantiation*, according to which there are two factors, viz.: the material bread and wine, and the immaterial or spiritual body of Christ united or consubstantiated in the consecrated sacramental symbols, does not differ in kind from the Popish doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, according to which, there is, indeed, but one element in the consecrated symbol, but that is the very body and blood of Christ, into which the bread and wine have been transmuted." Nothing is more difficult, than for a thinker or believer of one school, fairly to represent the opinions and faith of thinkers and believers of another school. On the points on which Dr. Shedd here dwells, his Puritanical tone of mind renders it so difficult for him to enter into the very heart of the historical faith of the Church, that we can hardly blame him, that if it were his duty to attempt to present, in his own language, the views of the Lutheran Church, he has not done it very successfully. From the moment he abandons the Lutheran sense of terms, and reads into them a Puritan construction, from that moment he wanders from the facts and unconsciously misrepresents.

In noticing Dr. Shedd's critique on this alleged feature of Romanism, we would say, in passing, that the Augsburg Confession does not teach the doctrine of *Consubstantiation*. From first to last, the Lutheran Church has rejected the name of *Consubstantiation* and everything which that name properly implies. Bold and uncompromising as our Confessors and Theologians have been, if the word *Consubstantiation*, (which is not a more human term than *Trinity* and *Original Sin* are human terms,) had expressed correctly their doctrine, they would not have hesitated to use it. It is not used in any Confession of our Church, and we have never seen it used in any standard dogmatician of our communion, except to condemn the term, and to repudiate the idea that our Church held the doctrine it involves. We might adduce many of the lead-

ing evidences on this point; but, for the present, we will refer to but a few. Bucer, in his Letter to Comander, confesses that "he had done injustice to Luther, in imputing to him the doctrine of Impanation," and became a defender of the doctrine he had once rejected. Gerhard, that monarch among our theologians, says: "To meet the calumnies of opponents, we would remark, that we neither believe in *Impanation* nor *Consubstantiation*, nor in any physical or local presence whatsoever. Nor do we believe in that consubstantiative presence, which some define to be the inclusion of one substance in another. Far from us be that figment. The heavenly thing and the earthly thing, in the Holy Supper, in the physical and natural sense, are not present with one another." Baier, among our older divines, has written a dissertation expressly to refute this calumny, and to show, as Cotta expresses it, "that our theologians are entirely free from it (*penitus abhorre-re.*)" Cotta, in his note on Gerhard, says: "The word *Consubstantiation* may be understood in different senses. Sometimes it denotes a local *conjunction* of two bodies, sometimes a commingling of them, as, for example, when it is alleged that the bread *coalesces* with the body, and the wine with the blood, into one substance. But in *neither sense* can that MONSTROUS DOCTRINE OF CONSUBSTANTIATION be attributed to our Church, since Lutherans do not believe either in that local conjunction of two bodies, nor in any commingling of bread and of Christ's body, of wine and of his blood." To pass from great theologians to a man of the highest eminence in the philosophical and scientific world, LEIBNITZ, in his Discourse on the Conformity of Reason with faith, says: "Evangelical (Lutherans) do not approve of the doctrine of *Consubstantiation* or of *Impanation*, and no one could impute it to them, unless he had failed to make himself properly acquainted with their views." To return again to theologians, REINHARD says: "Our Church has never taught that the emblems become one substance with the body and blood of Jesus, an opinion commonly denominated *Consubstantiation*." MOSHEIM says: "Those err who say that we believe in *Impanation*. Nor are those more correct who charge us with believing *Subpanation*. Equally groundless is the charge of *Consubstantiation*. All these opinions differ very far from the doctrine of our Church." This extract from Mosheim is given as a note to the only edition of Luther's Catechism

in English, authorized by our General Synod. This edition and the note were prepared by Dr. S. S. Schmucker, of Gettysburg. The same eminent divine had previously quoted this passage from Mosheim and the one from Reinhard, in his Appendix to the first edition of Storr and Flatt, and follows them with the remark: "With these views, too, the Augustan Confession perfectly accords," and then quotes the very words of the Confession on which Dr. Shedd relies to sustain his allegation that it does teach the error in question. The Rev. B. Kurtz, D. D. LL. D., in his work, "Why are you a Lutheran?" maintains, also, that the Augsburg Confession teaches no such error. We quote the last two authorities as of peculiar weight, since both of these gentlemen, though nominally Lutherans, have been specially distinguished as opponents of the sacramental doctrine of our Church.

If all the great Congregational authorities of New England, of the past century and the present, were quite agreed that a certain doctrine was *not* taught in the Saybrook Platform, and the "liberal" gentlemen of the Theodore Parker school were very zealous in showing that it *was* taught there, would not Dr. Shedd consider the affirmation as sealing the negation? Would he not think that, if it were possible to make a mistake in believing the great divines, there could be no mistake possible in disbelieving the "liberal" polemics? We beg him, therefore, as he desires to do, as he would be done by, not to think that our Lutheran Church, historically the mother of pure Churches, in some sense even of his own Church among them, has ever believed in the doctrine of Consubstantiation.

One word more, on the allegation of Dr. Shedd that there are Romanizing elements in our Confession. Nothing is more easy, and few things are more perilous, than for Protestants to insist that some peculiarity of this, or that part of a denominational system of doctrine is a relic of Romanism. Dr. Shedd makes this the solvent of our doctrine of the Lord's Supper, just as the Baptist makes it the solvent of Dr. Shedd's doctrine of infant baptism, and as the Socinian makes it the solvent of Dr. Shedd's doctrine of the Trinity, of the divinity of Christ, and of his propitiatory sacrifice. Not everything we learn from Rome is Romish. Not only so, but, as earnest evangelical Protestants, we may admit, that deep and vital as are

the points, in which we differ from Romanists, they are not so vital as those in which we agree with them, and that Evangelical Protestants are not so remote from Romanists as they are from false and heretical Protestants. Dr. Shedd (we use his name simply as giving concreteness to orthodox New England Congregationalism,) agrees with the Romanists as to the sole object of supreme worship, but he does not so agree with his Socinian New England cotemporaries, Protestant, *par excellence*, as these Socinians assume to be. Hence he is generically of the same religion with the Romanist, and would concede a fraternal affinity with Pascal, or Fenelon, which he could not with any Unitarian, however lovely in his personal character. We are not so much alarmed therefore, as some men pretend to be with mere coincidence with elements existing in the Romish Church. If anything in our Protestant doctrines or usages be, indeed, a perpetuation of what is *unscriptural* in the Romish system, it should be weeded out; but it does not follow, that because a thing is in Rome, it is of Rome. Once a pure Church of Christ, the Church of Rome never lost all of her original endowments. We feel that Dr. Shedd is altogether too conscientious and noble a man to attempt to excite this kind of anti-Romish odium as a cheap way of dispensing with argument. Nevertheless, so far as the authority of his name will carry weight with it, he has helped, by the sentences he has written, to increase the weight of unjust reproach which has been heaped upon our Church for centuries, for no other reason than for unswerving fidelity to what she is persuaded is the truth of God. Our Church does hold, as Dr. Shedd also does, without change, the great Trinitarian and Christological doctrines which were preserved in their purity in the Church of Rome, but our Church does not hold a view of the Lord's Supper coincident with that of Rome, derived from it, or sustained by the same kind of evidence, or open to the same invincible objections, scriptural, historical and practical. Dr. Shedd says: "This doctrine of Consubstantiation does not differ in kind from the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation." We need not stop here to repeat that our Church does not hold, and never did hold the doctrine of "Consubstantiation." Be that as it may, and waiving any further consideration of it for the present, we cannot agree with Dr. Shedd, that in the sense in which he seems to employ the words, our

doctrine "does not differ in *kind* from the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation." So far we concede that there is an agreement in *kind*, that over against a merely ideal presence of Christ, wrought by the human mind in its memory, or by its faith, our Church does hold to a true presence of the whole Christ, the factor of which is not our mind, but his own divine person. We do not think him into the Supper, but he is verily and indeed there. Faith does not put him there, but finds him there. So profoundly was Luther impressed with the importance of holding to a presence which did not play and fluctuate with the emotions and infirmities of man, but which rested on the all-sufficiency of the person of Christ, on which hangs the all-sufficiency of his work and promise—that deeply as he felt, and triumphantly as he combated the Romish error of Transubstantiation, he nevertheless declared that this error was not so radical as that of Zwingle (whose view Calvin himself stigmatized as *profane*,) and said, that if he must be driven to one extreme or the other, he would rather, with the Pope, have Christ's true body without the bread, than with Zwingle have the true bread without the true body. Surely, that is a glorious error, if error it be, which springs from trusting too far, too implicitly, in too child-like a way in the simple words of our adorable Lord! If the world divides on his utterances, we will err, if we err with those who, fettered by the word, bring every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ. It was not the power of education, not the influence of Romanistic leaven, but the might of the Word of God, interpreted in regard to the Lord's Supper by the very laws by which Luther was controlled in reaching the doctrine of justification by faith, and every other cardinal doctrine, it was this, and this only, which fixed his conviction. After the lapse of centuries, whose thoughts in this sphere we have striven to weigh, whether for, or against, the doctrine of our Church, with everything in the character of our times and of our land unfavorable to a community in the faith of our fathers, after a conscientious, prayerful examination of the whole ground, we confess, and if need were, through shame and suffering, God helping us, would continue to confess, our profound conviction that this doctrine which Dr. Shedd considers a relic of Romanism is Scriptural to its core, and that no process can dislodge it, which will not, carried logically

through, bring the whole temple of Evangelical truth to the ground. No man can defend the doctrine of the Trinity, and assail the Lutheran doctrine of the Eucharist on the same principles of interpretation.

Nevertheless, he who is persuaded that the Romish doctrine of Transubstantiation is unscriptural, is not thereby in the remotest degree logically arrayed against the Scriptural character of the doctrine of our Church. They are not, in such sense, of one kind as to warrant this species of suspicion. They are the results of greatly different modes of interpreting Scripture, Romanism and Zwinglianism, being of one kind in this, that they depart from the letter of God's Word, interpreted by just rules of language. The Lutheran and Romish views differ most vitally in their internal character and definition, the one taking its harmonious place in Evangelical doctrine, the other marring its grace and moral consistency; Romanism and Zwinglianism being of one kind in this, that both, in different ways, exhibit dogmatic superficiality and inconsequence. The Lutheran and Romish views are differently related to the doctrinal history of the Church, the one having its witnesses in the earliest and purest ages, the other being unknown to the ancient Church and generated in its decline; Romanism and Zwinglianism here being of one kind, in that both are unhistorical. The Lutheran and Romish views differ in their devotional and practical working; Romanism and Zwinglianism here being of one kind, in that both generate the common result of a feeble faith—the one, indeed, by reaction, the other by development. Nothing could be more remote from a just representation of the fact than the charge that, in any undesirable sense, the Romish and Lutheran views of the Lord's Supper are one in kind.

The Confessions of the Lutheran and of the Reformed Churches.

Dr. Shedd, after leaving the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, enumerates the "series of symbolical writings," "which constitute a part of Lutheran Symbolism," and mentions—1. The *Confessio Saxonica*; and, 2. The *Confessio Wurtzburgica*. Neither of these Confessions can be regarded as a proper part of the symbolical books of our Church. They were for temporary ends, and were confined in their official recognition to a very small part

of the Church. If Dr. Shedd is correct in supposing that the altered Confession of Melancthon of 1540 is Pelagianizing in regard to Regeneration, and more or less Calvinistic in regard to the Sacraments, it is not very likely that the Saxon Confession of 1551, from the same hand, would be received by the Lutheran Church without suspicion; and neither the claim made for it in its title, nor Dr. Shedd's endorsement of that claim, would overcome the innate improbability of its being "a repetition of the Augsburg Confession."

The Wurtemberg Confession of Brentius, which was written before Melancthon's, is sound enough, but never has obtained any general recognition. There are several writings which could have been classed among our symbols with more propriety than those mentioned by Dr. Shedd, as, for example, Luther's Confession of Faith, (1528;) the Articles of Visitation, (1592,) which are still authoritative in Saxony—often confounded in this country with the earlier Saxon Articles of Visitation, (1527;) and the *Consensus Repetitus* of 1661. Not one of them, however, belongs to the Confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church.

Dr. Shedd's account of the Formula Concordiæ strikes us as peculiarly unfortunate. No hint is given of the occasion for the Confession, of the urgent necessities out of which it arose, of the earnest desire for peace and unity which prompted its formation, of the patient labors running over many years, in which its foundations were laid, and of its masterly completion and the enthusiastic spontaneousness of its reception. The reader might imagine from Dr. Shedd's statements that this book was an effect without any just cause. He says: "It was drawn up by Andreae and others in 1577." The truth is, that the labors of 1577, in which Chemnitz was a greater worker than Andreae, were merely the finishing labors of years—labors whose results were embodied in the Torgau Book. The work of 1577 was, in reality, that of thorough revision. Dr. Shedd says the Formula Concordiæ was "presented to the Imperial Diet." We are at a loss to guess out of what misconception this statement could have originated. Not only is there no historical voucher for any such statement, but the thing itself, to any one who will recall the history of the times, will be seen at once to be absolutely impossi-

ble; and yet, Dr. Shedd, as if to show that there are degrees in the absolute, adds that this Imperial Diet "sought to secure its adoption by the Lutheran Church." All this is purely aerial. There was no such Diet, no such presentation, and no such recommendation. Dr. Shedd's pen is the magician's wand which has conjured up the whole. This is a serious charge to bring against so eminent a scholar; but, feeling the full responsibility involved in it, truth compels us to make it.

Reception of the Formula Concordiæ.

Dr. Shedd, still, in his aerial movement, says of this empirical Imperial Diet: "In this they were unsuccessful." Dropping any consideration of the lack of success of this hypothetical Diet, in its phantasmagorical Decrees, we might say that no official effort from any source has ever been made to secure the adoption of the Formula Concordiæ by the entire Lutheran Church. The great German princes and theologians to whom the Formula owed its existence made no effort to bring it to the attention of the Lutheran Church in other lands, with the solitary exception of Denmark. Nevertheless, by its own internal merits this Formula secured from the first a reception by an immense majority of the Lutheran Churches, won its way against the deadliest opposition, was finally received, almost without exception, where it was at first rejected, has been acknowledged virtually in the few cases in which it has not been acknowledged officially, and is received now in almost every part of the Lutheran Church, in which her proper doctrinal life has not been disturbed by rationalistic or pseudo-Unionistic principles. It was originally signed by three Electors, three Dukes and Princes, twenty-four Counts, four Barons, thirty-five imperial cities, in all by eighty-six States of the Empire, and by eight thousand ministers of the Gospel. In Denmark, where it was received by the King with brutal violence, and its introduction prohibited under penalty of death, it has long since been accepted, in fact, if not in form, as a Symbol.* In Holstein it was formally adopted in 1647. In Sweden, because of the powerful influences tending to the restoration of Popery under the King, it could not at first secure an entrance; but in 1593, at the Council of Upsala, the

* Köllner, p. 575.

States determined upon its subscription, and its authority as a Symbol was confirmed by later solemn acts. In Pomerania and Livonia it obtained symbolical authority. In Hungary it was approved in 1593, and formally adopted in 1597. In France, Henry of Navarre desired to form a league with the Lutherans against the Catholics, but the acceptance of the Formula of Concord was made a condition on the part of the Evangelical States, and the negotiations were broken off. "The symbolical authority of the Formula of Concord for the Lutheran Church, as such," says Köllner, "can hardly be doubted. By far the larger part of those who regarded themselves as belonging to the Lutheran Church received it as their Symbol. And as, to use the words of the Elector Augustus, we have no Pope among us, can there be any other mode of sanctioning a Symbol than by a majority? To this is to be added, and should be especially noted, that a larger part of those who did not receive it, objected to do so, not on doctrinal grounds, but partly for political reasons, freely or compulsorily, as the case might be, partly out of attachment to Melancthon, partly out of a morbid vanity, because they had not been invited early enough to take part in framing the Concordia, and had consequently not participated in it—and partly because, in one land, those who had the most influence were Calvinistically inclined, although a large majority of the clergy approved of the doctrines of the Formula. The inference, therefore, is by no means to be made that there was a deviation in doctrine, because there was not an acceptance of the Formula."

Its Character and Contents.

It will be seen from this that Dr. Shedd hardly does justice to the historical dignity of this great Confession, when he says: "It was a polemic document, constructed by that portion of the Lutheran Church that was hostile to the Calvinistic theory of the Sacraments." Certainly, although the Formula is polemic in meeting error, its main end is irenical, and its general tone exceedingly moderate. When Dr. Shedd leaves the reader to imagine that this Confession was not only, as it would seem from his representation mainly, but was exclusively directed against the Calvinistic theory of the Sacraments, he does injustice to the Formula and to the reader. Of the twelve Articles, but one is devoted to either of the Sacraments, and in the

others there is much in which true Calvinists would feel a deep sympathy—much that nobly defends great points of doctrine common to the whole Evangelical faith. In the first Article, which treats of original sin—in the second, of the freedom of the will—in the third, of Justification—in the fourth, of good works—in the fifth, of the Law and Gospel—in the sixth, of the third use of the Law, the most rigid Calvinist would be forced to confess that there is a noble and Scriptural presentation of those great doctrines. They defend what all pure Christendom is interested in defending. In many of the antitheses of the twelfth article a Calvinist would heartily join, as he would in the masterly discussion of the adiaphora in Article tenth. In Article eleventh, of the eternal foreknowledge and election of God, the Calvinist would find the distinctive doctrine of Calvin rejected, but he could not but be pleased with the profound reverence and exquisite skill, with which the doctrine is discussed, and by which it is redeemed from the extreme of Calvinism without running into the opposite and far more dangerous one of Pelagianism, or of low Arminianism. In the Articles, seventh and eighth, a Calvinist might discover much in regard to the Lord's Supper and the Person of Christ, in which he might not concur; and in Article ninth, on the Descent of Christ into Hell, he would find a view very different from Calvin's, which Calvinists themselves now almost universally reject. Nevertheless, he would discover in such a perusal, as he certainly would not from Dr. Shedd's account, that this supposed polemic document, originating in opposition to the Calvinistic theory of the Sacraments, really defends much more than it attacks that which Calvinists love.

The Doctrine of Ubiquity.

Dr. Shedd says: "It carries out the doctrine of Consubstantiation" (which our Church never held) "into a technical statement," (every part of which had long before been made.) "Teaching the ubiquity of Christ's body," says Dr. Shedd, though the Formula itself never speaks of the "ubiquity" of Christ's body. "Ubiquity" was a term invented by those who wished to fix upon our Church the imputation of teaching a local omnipresence or infinite extension of the body of Christ—errors which the Formula, and our whole Church with it, reject in the strongest

terms. The doctrine of the Formula is that the body of Christ has no intrinsic or essential omnipresence as the divinity has; that after its own intrinsic manner, and in virtue of its own essential qualities, it has a determinate presence, and in that mode of presence is not upon earth; but that, after ANOTHER MODE, supernatural, illocal, incomprehensible, and yet real, it is rendered present, "where Christ will," through the divine nature, which has received it into personal union.

If the question were asked: How is God omnipresent? How can the undivided totality of his substance be in each part of the universe? How can it be all in heaven and all on earth, and all on earth without ceasing in any measure to be all in heaven, and without motion or extension, without multiplication of presences, and so that there is no more of God in the whole universe than there is in each point of it? If such a question were asked Dr. Shedd, we presume that, bowing before the inscrutable mystery, he would reply: God is present after the manner of an infinite Spirit—a manner most real, but utterly incomprehensible to us. Grant, then, that this infinite spirit has taken to itself a human nature, as an inseparable element of its person, the result is inevitable. Where the divine is, the human must be. The primary and very lowest element of a personal union is the co-presence of the parts. To say that the divine nature of Christ is personally present without his humanity, is to deny that this humanity is a part of that personality, and the doctrine of the incarnation falls to the dust: Christ becomes no more than the organ of a special revelation of Deity: his humanity is no more properly one person with God than the burning bush was one person with Jehovah. Accepting the doctrine of a real incarnation, the omnipresence of the human nature of Christ, not in itself, (in which respect its presence is determinate,) but through the divine, is a necessary result and involves no new mystery. If that whole Godhead which dwells in Christ's body can, without motion, without leaving heaven, or extending itself, be present with us on earth, then can it render present with us, without motion or extension, that other nature which is one person with it. What the divine nature of Christ has of itself, his human nature has *through* the divine, which has taken it to be one person with itself. This is one result of that doctrine of the *Communicatio idiom-*

atum, of which, as we shall see in a moment, Dr Shedd offers so extremely inaccurate a definition. If the Evangelical Lutheran is asked, how can Christ's human nature be present with us? he can reply, after the manner in which an infinite Spirit renders present a human nature, which it has taken to be an inseparable constituent of its own person, a manner most real, but utterly incomprehensible to us. This is the doctrine at which Dr. Shedd levels, as has often been done before him, the term Ubiquity. It was the *whole* Christ—the man as well as the God—who said: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." It was the *whole* Christ who said: "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." And what the whole Christ promised, the whole Christ will perform. On any other theory, the Christian on earth has no more a personal Christ with him than the Patriarchs had; the New Dispensation has made no advance on the Old; the divine nature, the second person of the Trinity, was just as much on earth then as he is now; and all the light, peace and joy which a sense of the actual nearness, tender guardianship, and personal sympathy of an incarnate Christ sheds upon the soul, vanish in a haze of hyperboles, a miserable twilight of figures of speech, and the vigorous and soul-sustaining objectivity of Faith faints into a mere sentimentalism. Cold speculation has taken our Lord out of the world he redeemed, and has made heaven, not his throne, but a great sepulchre, with a stone rolled against its portal.

Dr. Shedd says, moreover, in his extremely compact statement of the doctrinal essence of the Formula, (of which our readers, with the close of this sentence, will have every word,) that it teaches "the *communicatio idiomatum*, or the presence of the divine nature of Christ in the sacramental elements." We cannot refrain from expressing our amazement that the writer of a History of Christian Doctrine should give such a definition of so familiar a term. We are forced almost to the conclusion—and it is the mildest one we can make for Dr. Shedd—that he has ventured to give a statement of the doctrine of our Formula, without having read it with sufficient care to form a correct judgment as to the meaning of its most important terms. His definition of the *Communicatio idiomatum* has, however, been equalled by one of our own theo-

logical scholars, who uses the term "hypostatical union" to designate the "distinctions in the persons of the Trinity," and who, when his mistake was pointed out, denounced as miserable bigotry the effort to prevent a man from using terms with any meaning he might see fit to attach to them.

The Doctor closes this paragraph with these words, which certainly exhibit no very deep insight into the internal history of our Church: "The Lutheran Church is still divided upon this Symbol. The so-called High Lutherans insist that the Formula Concordiae is the scientific completion of the preceding Lutheran Symbolism," (Dr. Shedd seems to us constantly to use the word "Symbolism" inaccurately;) while the moderate party are content to stand by the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Smalcald Articles." We can assure Dr. Shedd, if we know anything of the Lutheran Church, that it is not to be classified in this way. A man may hold very firmly, that the Formula is the scientific completion of the system of the earlier Symbols, and may reject it and them, or receive them with a reservation; on the other hand, a man may be satisfied with the Augsburg Confession alone, but receiving it in good faith, will be as high a Lutheran as Dr. Shedd would like to see. According to Dr. Shedd's definition, the "American Lutherans" are not of the "moderate party," nor, indeed, Lutherans at all. The real point of classification as to the relation of nominal Lutherans to the Confession seems to us to be mainly this: Evangelical Lutherans, who are such in the historical sense, heartily receive as scriptural statements of doctrine, the Confessions of the Church in their proper meaning as reached by the laws of language; while others who wear the name, claim the right, in varying degrees of practical latitude, to set aside, at their pleasure, part of these doctrines. This is the vital issue, and its character is substantially the same, whether a few of the Symbols or all of them are in question. We might add that, under this latitudinarian claim, there have actually been sheltered in the Lutheran Church in this country such soul-destroying errors as Socinianism and Universalism, and that, where the tendency has not run into the grosser heresies, the pervading characteristic of those who represent its extremes is that of laxity in doctrine, government, discipline and morals. There is yet a third class, who, largely revealing practi-

cally the spirit of a genuine Lutheranism, and more or less sympathizing with its controverted doctrines, yet, without a positive acceptance of them, confess that the logic of the position is with historical Lutheranism, and are never consciously unjust to it. This class are regarded with affection and respect by the thoroughly conservative part of the Church, and are bitterly assailed, or noisily claimed by the fanatical element, as the anger produced by their moderation, or the hope inspired by their apparent neutrality predominates.

Dr. Shedd, after disposing of the Lutheran Confession in what, our readers will have seen, we do not consider a very satisfactory manner, next discusses the "Reformed (Calvinistic) Confessions." In this whole section he assumes the identity of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic systems, in which we are forced to regard him as mistaken. In the heart of doctrine and tendency, pure Calvinism is more Lutherizing than Zwinglianizing, for Zwingle was largely Pelagian. Dr. Shedd seems to recognize nothing of the mediating tendency of the school of Bucer, nor of the Melancthonian type of doctrinal statement, but with a classification which seems too sweeping and inaccurate, considers the Tetrapolitan, which was prepared several years before Calvin was known as a theologian, (and which seems to be the first confessional statement of that doctrine of the Lord's Supper which now bears his name,) the *Fidei Ratio* of Zwingle, the Heidelberg Catechism, the Canons of Dort and the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, all as belonging to the same class of Confessions. Certainly, if the words Reformed and Calvinistic are synonyms, as Dr. Shedd makes them, this grouping is open to very serious objections. When Dr. Shedd reaches the Heidelberg Catechism, he bestows so little care upon the arrangement of his facts, that the incautious reader might be led into very serious mistakes. He might suppose, for instance, that Frederick the First was a successor of John Casimer. He is told, in express terms, that Louis the Sixth brought the Palatinate under the Formula Concordiæ in 1576, (four years before it was published,) and if he is not on his guard, will be sure to imagine that the troubles which followed the mutations of 1576, and the subsequent ones under John Casimer, (1583—1592, led to the formation of the Heidelberg Catechism in 1562. Dr. Shedd continues to call the Electors (we know not why)

"Crown Princes," and in general seems to stumble from the moment he gets on German ground. What will intelligent preachers and laymen in the German Reformed Church think, for instance, of this eulogy; with which the notice of the Heidelberg Catechism closes: "In doctrine, it teaches justification with the Lutheran glow and vitality, predestination and election with Calvinistic firmness and self-consistency, and the Zwinglian theory of the Sacraments with decision, * * * and is regarded with great favor by the High Lutheran party of the present day." We will not undertake to speak for our German Reformed brethren, except to say that this is not the sort of thing they talked, at their Ter-Centenary, and put into their handsome volume. As to "the High Lutherans of the present day," if we are of them, as we are sometimes charged with being, Dr. Shedd is right: the Heidelberg Catechism *is* regarded by them with great favor—all except its doctrines. It is a neat thing—a very neat thing—the mildest, most winning piece of Calvinism of which we know. One-half of it is Lutheran, and this we like very much, and the solitary improvement we would suggest in it would be to make the other half of it Lutheran, too. With this slight reservation, on this very delicate point, the High Lutherans are rather fond of it than otherwise, to the best of their knowledge and belief.

As the title of this Article shows, we have not proposed to ourselves a general review of Dr. Shedd's book, but simply to look at it with reference to its statements in regard to our own Church. Nevertheless, we cannot avoid an allusion to what strikes us an extreme statement in apparent conflict with sound Theology. It is in his declaration that "sin is *in the strictest sense* a creature." "The originant act of self-will is *strictly* creative from nothing." Dr. Shedd here seems to labor to show that he is not speaking in a popular and rhetorical way, but that over against such a style of language, he wishes to be understood rigidly—sin is a creature—but God is not its creator. Man is as really and as strictly a creator as God is—and sin is his creature. Such language, if pressed, seems inconsistent with the nature of God, of man, of sin, and of creature. It denies that God is the alone Creator of all things, it maintains, almost after a Manichean style that evil is a primal principle and that man is the Ahriman

of it; it makes sin an objective reality, not the condition or act of a subject, and elevates the mutilation and disease of the creature to a rank in being with the creature itself. No more than the surgeon creates by cutting off the leg of a man, does man *create* sin by a self-originated destruction of his original righteousness, on which follows that inordinate state of the natural reason and appetites which theologians call concupiscense. The impulse to theft, to lying, to impurity, is not a substance, not a creature, but is the result of inordinate desire in which self-love, now unchecked by original righteousness and kindled by the fumes of the self-corrupted will, reveals itself. It is not a creature, but a moral phenomenon of the creature—desire and purpose, are not creatures, but exercises of the faculties of the creature. If sin be strictly a creature, it must be the creature of God, and this part of Dr. Shedd's theory really would make God the author of sin, an inference which, we are sure, no one would more earnestly resist than himself. The finite will can corrupt the creatures, but it cannot add to them.

ARTICLE V.

SCHISM AND PROTESTANTISM.

By Rev. JACOB WEIDMAN, A. M., Baltimore.

THE state of Protestantism presents so many denominations and sects, that importance attaches to the subject, proposed in the present article. Especially in America, the Churches of the Reformation are represented by emigrants of many nationalities and these original divisions, again, by so many of later origin. These, with the disputes arising between them, give to the infidel occasion of attack upon Christianity, and place stumbling-blocks in the path of the simple minded. Rome, by reason of her outward unity, seizes hold of them as a chief argument in favor of her monstrous and arrogant claims, while the disputes and alienation arising therefrom, and the expenditure of church resources in the maintenance of needless

machinery wound the heart of the most resolved Protestant. It is not the purpose of these remarks to propose a plan of general comprehension which shall do away with all useless division, or recommend such a union as will do away with all the sects—this only can be hoped for when corruption shall have completely lost its power in all saints, and the prayer, "Thy kingdom come," have met its fulfilment. It is only hoped that some considerations, profitable to all, may be set forth, and lead to Scriptural views on this subject.

It is not necessary that we should insist here on the evils involved in Schism. From the cavils and attacks of enemies, and the opinions and feelings of Christians we conclude they are manifold. Here surely the maxim of authority, *quod semper, quod ubique, quodque omnes*, is conclusive, for not only all who bear the Christian name, but all without the pale of the Church give testimony. Infidel and Romanist join with Protestant, and acquiesce in the language of Francis Turretin, in his treatise, "*De necessaria secessione nostra ab ecclesia Romana*." "We freely grant to our adversaries, that secession from the true Church is never to be justified, and they worthily incur the accusation of schismatics, who desert the true Church under any pretext whatsoever." "It is as true," he adds, "that there is no salvation out of the true Church, as that there was no safety out of the ark." And with the definition he gave of the true Church, no Protestant need fear to accept his words. Individuals or even denominations, may diverge in the detail of the evils attaching to Schism according to their minor peculiarities, or more according to their several positions, but when these do not bias the judgment, there is very general agreement.

In view of this, it is an inquiry of moment to all, to ministers with vows of ordination, and to members with vows of consecration to Christ; as to what separations in the communion of the disciples constitute Schism, and what evil attaches to it. We propose therefore to set forth a Scriptural view of Schism, and a comparison of this with later views before offering some general views as inferences from these.

The word Schism, in its ecclesiastical sense, has a biblical origin. There we find *σχίσμα* and *ἑτερονομία* used in parallel senses, and it is sufficient for our present purposes to trace the use of the latter. This is confined to the historical por-

tions of the New Testament and the first epistle to the Corinthians. Its original classical meaning occurs in Matt. 9 : 16, and Mark 2 : 21. Its peculiar Scripture sense is two-fold. John, in 7 : 43 ; 9 : 16 and 10 : 19, uses it with reference to a difference of opinion, with or without special reference to its moral complexion. A second moral application appears in 1 Cor. 1 : 10 ; 11 : 18 and 12 : 25. In the latter passages there is an evident attribute of sin attached to Schism. In the first, Paul marks the divisions (*σχίσματα*) with emphatic condemnation. They are a prominent occasion of his writing, and he shows his abhorrence of them by his earnest exhortations. "Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you." In the second of these passages, it is applied to divisions among Christians in their coming together to the Lord's Supper, and the extent of its meaning is to be gathered from the next verse. "For there must be heresies (marg. sects, Greek, *αἰρέσεις*) among you, that they which are approved may be manifest." In John 12 : 25, it is used with reference to the natural body, but in a passage, illustrative of the true Church, and this so directly, that from this passage has flowed its later usage. For it will be seen that its modern ecclesiastical sense is more closely akin to this, than any other found in the New Testament.

In the Scriptures, then, the term Schism is applied to contentions about matters of doctrine and practice in the Church of Corinth. There were found in that communion those who asserted that their peculiarities flowed from Paul or Peter, peculiarities which really had their origin in the fact, that they retained Judaism to some degree, and for this claimed to be the followers of Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, or rejected too much its obligations and proclaimed themselves the followers of the apostle of the Gentiles. Or there were others who perhaps esteemed themselves above these controversies about justification by faith and the obligations of the law, and laid their higher claims to exact accordance with Christ himself and the simplicity of his teaching. Schism, too, comprehended those who made the eloquence of Apollos the matter of party strife. All these, in the view of Paul, are schismatics, not excepting those under his own name. Their

contentions were the offspring of corruption of heart and the pursuit of personal aims or interests.

From this we may gather the meaning of the word in the Scriptures, and the grounds of its condemnation. Generally these grounds are as follows:

1. They disturbed or destroyed the unity of the Church, and, 2. They were exhibitions of corruption within its pale, inimical to the growth of piety.

1. The Church is one. Its structure is as compact as that of the human body. The Church has members differing in their functions, and subordination is necessary to health and harmony. The body must be subject to the mind. Thus the Church must be subject to its head, and each member must rejoice in its appropriate office. In case the Church fail to have one Lord, one faith, one baptism, or one rise up against his brother, it cannot grow up into him in all things which is the head, even Christ, joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part. Schism, therefore, in the body of Christ defeats the purpose of its head in its constitution. It fails to manifest his glory by unity in its Lord, in faith and love. It fails to discharge the function of material edification. It robs each member of the encouragement which sympathy and unity of purpose lend to the individual in his efforts for himself or others. It counteracts that strength which is a geometrical ratio of progression in proportion to numbers—for a hundred men, taken singly, cannot oppose successfully an attack easily repelled by ten acting in association. It lays the Church open to attacks from without, while sin rages with increased violence in the world, because of the paralysis in all aggression by a Church, torn by dissension.

It is true that Schism has been overruled for good to the Church. The discussions, consequent upon it, have defined doctrine and revealed the methods available for the arrest of error. God has presided over the contests in the Church most marvellously, so that the prevalence of great reverses like the Arian, or great practical abuses, like those of the Middle Ages, or great revolutions, like those of the last century in Europe, have resulted in directing the attention of the Church to the importance of the fundamental articles of faith, or given rise to contests which have rescued the Church from corruption, or dem-

onstrated the workings of evil, so as to make the world acknowledge Christ. As the lie of Ananias, discovered and punished, arrested the growth of hypocrisy when the Church was in its infancy, and the envious preaching at Philippi furthered the interests of the gospel it aimed to destroy, so will every event be made to work for the glory of God in the Church. But these good results are only incidental, and arise not naturally from the contentions themselves, but in spite of them, only by the faithfulness of God in the administration of his providence and grace. He will secure his glory in the Church against the kingdom of Satan, he will arrest the workings of sin in the Church in such a manner as to promote his manifold purposes, but each Schism, founded on a false doctrine, or sinful practice, works against the interests of his kingdom and the glory of his name, just so far forth as it has developed itself.

2. The second general ground, on which the Scriptures condemn Schism, is personal. It is the working of the corruptions of the human heart. Contentions in the Church about doctrine or practice are always justified by the actors, by the necessity for the maintenance of truth and purity. Controversialists are ever ready to allege, that it is an inspired injunction which urges them earnestly to contend for the faith once delivered to the saints, or to point in other strifes to the sharp dissension between Paul and Barnabas about Mark, or the conduct of Paul in withstanding Peter to the face, when the truth of the gospel was endangered. They who mourn over all conflict and sharpness in the Church may well comfort themselves by the reflection that the Saviour denounced the Pharisees as bitterly as possible for their false doctrine and forgetfulness of judgment and mercy. Yet it becomes all who leave the mildness which characterizes the gospel to remember that these things are nearly allied to contentions constituting Schism, and to guard against the personal accompaniments of the latter. The love of truth and the interests of morality will always contend with each other, because sin will always insinuate itself into the belief and practice of even true Christians. Yet in general the word of God teaches that unity and peace characterize faith and love, while division and strife flow from the corruptions of the heart. "From whence come wars and fightings among you? come they not hence, even of your lusts which war

in your members." Jas 4 : 1. Among the works of the *flesh* (Gal. 5 : 20,) are hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies. The spirit of contest is very nearly allied to wrath, malice, revenge and ambition. Almost every controversialist has exhibited some defect of truth or temper when he has entered the lists. Contentions in the Church, like party strifes or wars in the world, have been marked by alliance with interest, ambition and pride. Uncharitableness and false imputations on the one hand, impatience and want of forbearance (on the other, have marred the characters of the combatants. They are easily led to the magnification of moles into beams in opponents, and a corresponding disregard of our own faults in doctrine or practice. They disrupt our relations with those whom we acknowledge Christians equally with ourselves. They consume our energies in warring with brethren, instead of our most determined enemies. They are so pregnant with evil that names, free from any other reproach, are yet darkened by shadows cast upon them by the memory of the contests, in which they are concerned. We do not wonder therefore that they are so pointedly condemned by Paul and that he treated them with a severity he would gladly have avoided, or that the Saviour has engrailed among the beatitudes the words: "Blessed are the peace-makers."

From the above consideration the definition of Schism, as it appears in the Scripture, is to be drawn. It is strife resulting from error in either doctrine or life within a single congregation disturbing, without severing, it. In present usage it is applied only to formal separation in a congregation or denomination, or to such contention as is supposed to have this as its result. In the word of God there is no instance of such an application. Yet from the grounds on which we have seen the Schism there mentioned condemned, we may easily derive its modern signification. And it may tend to keep us alive to the evils of this sin, if we remember that this word has its origin in those contentions which are so named in the Scriptures, and with which we are so often brought into contact in Churches of to-day.

In the passages of Scripture adduced, the application of the word Schism, which is nearest that of our own day, still stops short of it, in that it refers only to contention and partizanship in a single communion, without formal

separation as its issue. This has given rise to a curious interpretation of the sin, in the interest of Independency. Founding upon this, John Owen, the greatest of their theologians, denies that Schism can be charged upon any, save the author of like contentions. A man can only be called a schismatic rightfully who is the cause of contention in a single brotherhood. If he succeeds in carrying the whole body harmoniously from its old connexions, he may be a heretic or apostate, but he is not to be charged with Schism. This is an extreme of literal interpretation, not required by the system of government which this great man advocated, and amounting to nothing more in his hands than a strife about words. For he would not apologize for the man who broke the cords that bind Churches of the same faith in sympathy, and minister to mutual edification and usefulness. Only he would reserve the word Schism for the crime so designated in the Bible, and set another for the kindred crime. Yet such a restriction could only be countenanced by one whose views of the unity of the whole Church were influenced by looseness of Independency as a form of government.

In the extreme contrast with this, is that of Rome. All separation from the external communion, headed by the Pope is, by the necessity of the definition of the Church by the Council of Trent, Schism. This affirms the visible unity and infallibility of the Church to be inseparable, and then, asserting as the eternal Father gave Christ to be the invisible head, so the Pope, as the legitimate successor of Peter, prince of the apostles, is the visible head. (Cat. Rom. Pars. I Qu. 10.) All not submitting to him are therefore guilty of Schism.

The usual Protestant definition of Schism goes to neither of these extremes. It is not confined to those things expressly so called in Scripture, nor does it accept such a definition, as makes all separation from a visible communion amount to Schism. It does not restrict the crime so as to make it impossible, save in a single congregation, but agrees with Rome that it may be committed against the Catholic Church. While again it rejects that definition of the Church, which makes it a visible organization, claiming infallibility, and then asserts that all separation from it is Schism. It condemns Schism as a sin against the universal Church, as well as against the body which it has disturbed, but holds with Cassander, as quoted by Turret-

tin, *Schisma non facit separatio, sed causa*. It therefore can charge the visible Church with the guilt of this sin, which is impossible to any one holding the Romish view of the Church. It is important to remark that not every separation on the part of an individual or congregation from another is accounted Schism in the eyes of a Protestant. Even in the Romish communion there are differences that correspond to the divisions of Protestantism, though, of course, these differences are so far controlled as is necessary to maintain the headship of the occupant of Peter's chair. Yet this unity is far from the completeness they assert. The Augustine and Dominican monks, Gerson and Bellarmin differ in their system of theology and Church government, as much as many Protestant sects. Many of the differences between denominations are nothing more than those of the orders of the Romish monks which are in subordination to the Pope. There is a sense, in which there is more real unity in the Churches of the Reformation than the vaunted unity of Rome. Certainly Luther and Calvin are more at one, than Ambrose, Jerome and Augustine are one with Aquinas and Duns Scotus. A change then from one to the other is no more a Schism than a change from one order to another with the papal communion. In view of the definition of Schism by Protestantism, it is evident that a Christian is guilty of Schism in proportion to the falsity of doctrine or to the degree of immorality which he advocates, and the degree of contention which results. Separation, when dictated by the real interest of the Church, may be not only harmless, but good. A Christian may change from one denomination to a better, and so far from committing Schism, be praiseworthy in view of it, though he condemns the body from which he separates in so doing.

These observations in connection with what has been said will conclude this article.

I. Protestantism was not a Schism in its origin. Rome has been joined by some who bear the Protestant name in this charge. There are many to whom it suggests but little else. To these it seems the vindication of the freedom of thought and conscience against the assumed infallibility of the Church necessitate the endless divisions which have appeared with the Churches of the Reformation. They assume that the emancipation of the human mind from the

authority and superstition of Rome frees it from subjection to any authority. The interests of the Pope join here with Rationalists, and they forget or obscure the fact that it is no more notorious that Luther and his compeers protested against the authority of Rome than that they avowed their subjection to the Word of God. They did not appeal from the decisions of the Church to the decisions of reason, but from the infallibility of the Pope to the infallibility of the Bible, asserting that the humblest private Christian was as capable of understanding the inspired record of the Holy Ghost as the deliverances of the Holy See, and protesting against departures from sound doctrine and pure practice, not mainly because these were opposed to reason, but to God's Word. They abjured the false authority claimed by the Church only that they might be more directly and completely be subject to Christ.

The conduct of Luther and his assistants at the beginning of the Reformation shows that they did not claim the right to destroy the unity of the Church on the mere ground of private judgment. They were at first far from proposing to themselves a separation from the other Churches of Christendom. All their early movements demonstrate this. The publication of the Theses was one of the ordinary methods of discussion among the members of Universities. His conferences with the champions of Rome or papal legates do not betray a desire to break the unity of believers. His whole movement in its first stages is hardly to be distinguished from the spirit of the great reforming councils of Pisa, Constance and Basil, calling for a reformation of the Church in its head and members. In the public answers, rendered at Worms, Augsburg and Spires, the Reformers showed their willingness to preserve the unity of the Church, if it could be done in consistence with the supremacy of the Word of God. And it was not Luther who separated from the Church, but it was the bull of Leo X which separated him from it.

It cannot, therefore, be charged that Protestantism was a Schism on the ground that its leaders voluntarily separated themselves. But it will yet be said that they were Schismatic, inasmuch as their opinions disturbed the faith and peace of the Church, and furnished the just occasion of the exclusion. It is true, that he that furnishes the ground of separation is the guilty party in a Schism. This was acknowledged by the Reformers. They never

justified their secession by any other reason than the heresies and abuses of Rome. The Reformers insisted that the idolatry practiced and persisted in by the Church, especially in the mass, the intolerant tyranny, by which she hoarded wealth and crushed opposition to her corruption, her identity with Babylon in the Apocalypse with reference to which it was said, "Come ye out of her, my people," and with the Antichrist were insisted on, in justification of Protestantism. These were the cause of the Schism, and if they have been established, it was not Luther but Rome that was guilty, though in pronouncing the sentence of excommunication, the Pope was seated in the temple of God, showing himself that he was God, and though he was at the head of the greater number of those who professed the name of Christ.

The second general reflection which the subject suggests is that the state of division in Protestantism is the demonstration of the existence of the guilt of Schism. It has been observed that mere separation is not a decisive proof of this. There are such arrangements which do not mar the unity, but promote the efficiency of the Church, just as a wise disposal of the military force of a government, may better effect its safety than the centralization under one. It is, that the late brilliant and decisive movements of the armies of Prussia were direct from a central office, and though operating apart from each other, and without the knowledge that they were co-operating, yet jointly effected the purpose of their ruler. So separate denominations and organizations in the Church may act harmoniously in subjection to the Lord, without the visibility which Rome strives to realize by subjection to a vice-gerent. Locality and facility of operation have always been allowed to exercise an important influence on organization, for even Rome goes to the verge of limitation to centralization in allowing a Plenary Council, an originating power in making decrees, only guarding against inconsistency with former doctrine or canons before confirming them. The mere want of organic unity does not interfere with the real unity of the Lutheran Church and its offshoots in different lands. So long as these hold the same creed and agree in government, so long they are one, and are Schismatic no more than the Church of Ephesus and Corinth which recognized no common organization as controlling them.

But the majority of Protestant divisions is not due to

locality or facility of operation. Confessedly they owe their separation to differences in creed and forms of government. Their names are the symbols by which they proclaim this. If we have found Schism in the Reformation, and decided that the guilt of it lay with the latter, so must it be decided that, in all Protestant divisions where locality and facility have not directed this, there is like guilt on one side or the other. As war is the certain evidence of wrong-doing, oppression and ambition on the part of one or both the combatants, so division, for the most part, or sectarianism is a reproach to the Protestant. Respective creeds or forms of government may indicate the claim of one to Scriptural purity, but in the indication yields the evidence of the guilt of Schism on the part of the other. These symbols may show that the differences are not fundamental, but prove, either that their importance is such as to justify a separation that may bring weakness, or that Christians are so given to Schism as not to live in harmony, while their doctrines are sufficiently accordant, which is to say that strife has mastered love. If it be alleged that these sects are hereditary, this does not do away with their Schismatical character always, but only proves that the disease which gives rise to parties and secession is not temporary, but chronic. If we affirm that the unity of Protestantism is substantially more complete than that of Rome, this may modify the claims of Rome, but cannot do away with the weakness and contention in our Churches. From the days of the Conference of Marburg, Protestantism has suffered from unnecessary strife and contention, and these will always be a reproach to Christ, a weakness to the Church, and a sin on man's part.

3. The last reflection which we suggest as of importance in this connection, is as to the reasons which justify a secession from a denomination, other than locality or efficiency, or a mere change of church-fellowship, which does not infer Schism. Ecclesiastical history may give us some guidance. There are some secessions from existing churches, which, in the common opinion of those who observed them with impartiality, have been good in the effects, and the example of the leaders of these ought to have weight in the determination of the inquiry. Here we will see that the best men have been most alive to the evils of strife, even when the maintenance of truth forced it upon them—that they have either hesitated long before

they advised or acquiesced in separation, or generally they have striven to preserve the unity of the bodies, from which they have been excluded. Sufficient has been said with reference to the Reformers to indicate this on their part. The rise of Methodism under Wesley, and Whitfield in the Church of England, exhibits the same thing in that case. In the Free Church of Scotland, though at the last the act of separation was solemnly executed under the advice of Chalmers, Welsh, Cunningham and other good men, it was only after years had been spent in useless attempt to secure rights guaranteed by the Constitution of the Church of Scotland, and denied them by the civil powers and the dominant party in the established Church. As an individual instance of the same strong abhorrence of separation, let us remember the course of the priest John Gossner, the originator of a large missionary force in India, and a fervent preacher of justification by faith in Prussia and St. Petersburg. This never took one step to complete his separation from Rome, though driven from parish to parish, and from his native land, by the hatred of those who could not endure sound doctrine.

With these examples before him, no good man will lightly attempt to set up a new organization. There are evils, which almost always accompany contentions, which ought to be well weighed with the advantages to be gained. The attempt to go out from a Church generally involves questions of Church property, the opposition of a minority, these, perhaps, continue for years—many times, the total extinction of both parties after an embittered struggle. If the separation, too, be a standing aloof from all organizations, it generally cuts off the separatists from coöperation in the schemes of benevolence of an older body, turns the attention of a congregation from the calm consideration of their own salvation to a heated discussion of the faults of their neighbors. Almost the whole resources of a small body will be spent in the maintenance of their own existence, instead of being spent in aggressive efforts upon the kingdom of Satan. These, with other efforts, seen in the history of all such attempts, will make a good man pause long ere he deliberately sanctions such a course, and seems to lead to these two rules of conduct:

1. So long as we are permitted to hear or preach the gospel as professed in the creed which we have professed, we cannot be justified in disturbing the body of Christ by

contention. Removal from fellowship may be quietly accomplished, if we judge the creed at fault.

2 In reference to such decisions, as are temporary in their effects, or concern doctrines relatively unimportant, if we have conceded to us the right of dissent by protest, we ought never to enter upon measures, necessitating separation as their issue.

In conclusion, let us remember that the best remedy for Schism in the Church, is that which is so eloquently described in the thirteenth chapter of Corinthians, as an essential element of Christian character—love. He that suffereth long and is kind; that envieth not, that vaunteth not himself, is not puffed up, beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things, will not uselessly disturb the body of Christ. This will enable us to fulfil the exhortation of Paul to the Ephesians, to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith we are called, with all lowliness and meekness; to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. Love seems weakness to the Schismatic, but it is the strongest support of the truth.

ARTICLE VI.

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTMAS PRESENTS.

By Prof. L. W. HETDENREICH, Bethlehem, Pa.

THE custom to make presents on Christ's nativity traces its origin up to a high antiquity; it has existed for centuries, and continues to exist. On this day we make presents to children and friends, and receive from them in return, and thereby afford joy to others and secure pleasure for ourselves, mostly without knowing and inquiring into the origin of this practice. The question—*Whence did this custom originate?*—being, in our opinion, not destitute of interest, we shall attempt to answer it.*

* In treating this subject we chiefly made use of an essay which we found in the 3rd vol. p. 43 of Dr. Johann Friedrich Teller's *Anekdoten für Prediger*. Leipzig, 1777 and 1778. We consulted, however, also, some other books.

Sebastian Mitternacht, formerly as Rector of the Gymnasium of Gera, maintains, in a programme in which he treats of this subject, that the Christians have borrowed this custom from the Jews, who distribute at the feast of tabernacles appropriate gifts among the poor, and especially among their children. It must be observed that during the celebration of this festival no presents of any kind were ever given, but on the following day, when the Jews celebrated another festival called, *The Rejoicing in the Law*, because on this day they finished in their synagogues the reading of the Law and began it again.* This second feast, on which, according to Buxtorf's statement,† the Jews, after the public worship, throw apples, pears, nuts and the like, among children, was, however, and may still be, considered as belonging to the former on account of its close connection with the feast of tabernacles.

The assertion that the Christians have been induced by the example of the Jews, to introduce Christmas presents, however plausible it may be at first view, is liable to well-founded objections.

The circumstance that feast of tabernacles occurs not in the same season with Christmas, does not favor the admission of this opinion. Moreover the dissimilarity which exists between the Christian custom and that of the Jews militates against this assumption, for the latter scatter publicly in their synagogues the fruit which they intend as presents to the children, while the Christians distribute their Christmas gifts in their homes, or put them in places, where they will be found unexpectedly. Again, when the celebration of Christmas was introduced, the hatred between Christians and Jews was so great, that the former detested the manners and customs of the latter, and disdained to put themselves on a level with this so much hated nation.

D. Ch. Specht, formerly a scholar of Wittenberg, who

* This festival is a late institution and did not exist at the time of the second temple. It is still celebrated by our cotemporary Jews. See Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie für prot-Theologie, Art. Laubbüttenfest. Vol. VIII. p. 223.

† Buxtorf de Synagog. Jud. Cap. 27, p. 943. Multos fructus utpote poma, nuces, pyra et alia id genus, in schola in turbam puerorum immittunt, ut illis quoque lætitiæ suppetant argumentum: verum sæpe fit, ut pugnis lætitia immittuntur.

has published a treatise on Christmas presents,* entertains another opinion. He thinks that the solemnization of this festival may be traced back to a very early epoch, yea to the beginning of Christianity, and believes that the custom to distribute Christmas presents has been coetaneous with its introduction. In support of his view, he relates, that already in the fourth century, a bishop of Myra, in Lycia, named Nicolas, gave a purse of gold to a poor man on Christmas. He quotes the testimony of Ambrose,† (Bishop of Milan from 374—397,) who reminds his sister that, when she took the veil, on this day, a great multitude of people had assembled to celebrate the nativity of her bridegroom, and that nobody had gone away without giving a present.

Finally, he refers to the discourses of Maximus,‡ Bishop of Turin, delivered on Christmas, in which he very forcibly exhorts his congregation to practice liberality on such festivals, and infers therefrom, that Christmas presents were not unknown to the Christians in the fourth and following centuries, if not already at an earlier epoch. In his opinion the practice, then prevalent, according to the testimony of Dio Cassius§ and other trustworthy authors, to celebrate the anniversaries of the birth of the emperors for two successive days, during which they received many valuable presents, has given occasion to the Christians to solemnize the birth-day of their King and Lord, not only during two, but for three days in succession, and to distribute presents.

Christ's nativity may have been celebrated here and there in the third century,|| but it was certainly then not generally solemnized. The observance of the festival, however, spread gradually, and, in the Eastern Church, the 6th of January, in the Western Church, the 29th of December, were the days which were considered and celebrated as the anniversaries of Christ's nativity. It was, towards the end of the fourth century, under the reign of

* D. Chr. Specht, de muneribus, quæ propter diem natalem Servatoris nostri dari solens. Witteb. 1737.

† Ambrosius de Virginitibus. Lib. III, 1.

‡ Maximus Taurinensis. Homil. VII. VIII. IX.

§ Lib. LIV, C. 39.

|| Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie für Protestantische Theologie u. Kirche, Vol. IV, p. 779 Kirchliche Feste. Guericke, Lehrbuch der Christlichen Kirchlichen Archæologie. 1847, p. 206.

Theodosius the Great, that, through the authority of Chrysostom* and other bishops, the Church of the East was prevailed on, also, to adopt the anniversary of the Western Church.† Reliable Roman documents, which had been found, and a very ancient tradition, which was traced up to the year 200, justifying the belief that Jesus was born on the 25th of December,‡ induced the Eastern Church to transfer its anniversary of Christ's nativity to the 25th of December, which day henceforth was solemnized as the birthday of Jesus. Chrysostom mentions this circumstance in the superscription of one of his sermons,§ in the exordium of which he says, "that he has long been desirous of knowing the precise day of Christ's nativity, but that his wish had been gratified only a short time since, for only within the last ten years the Eastern Church had received sure and authentic information that this day was the anniversary of Christ's birth."|| This agrees, also, with the statement of Epiphanius in his book, entitled *παράβολοι*, in which the discrepant opinions on this subject are mentioned. It appears, however, that Christmas was not generally celebrated in the Church of the East during the fourth century, and that this festival was by no means an old institution of the Church. Had the latter been the case, it would not have been possible to transfer it to another day without disturbance. Yea, it seems the anniversary of Christ's birth was not generally solemnized in this century, even in the Western Church, for Augustine** does not mention it in his enumeration of the Christian festivals ††

* Herzog's Real-Encyclopædie, II, p. 697. Art. Chrysostomus.

† Herzog XVII, p. 989. Art. Weihnachten.

‡ Sulpicius Severus. *Historia Sacra* I, c. 27.

§ This sermon is number XXXIII, tom. 9, *variorum sermonum de diversis* N. T. locis, p. 418. The inscription is: *ἕως τῆς γενέθλιον ἡμέραν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰ. Χριστοῦ. ἀδελφον μὲν ἔτι οὖσαν ποτε, πρό δε ὀλίγων ἔτων γνωρισθεῖσαν παρὰ τίνων, τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς δύσεως ἐλθόντων καὶ ἀναγγελλάντων.*

|| *καὶ τοὶ γὰρ πῶς δεκατὸν ἐστὶ ἔτος, ἐξ οὗ ὀλίγη καὶ γνώριμος ἦμιν αὕτη ἡ ἡμέρα γηγένηται.*

** *Epistola CXVIII, Cap. 1.*

†† It is strange, that the ancients disagree much more about the year of Christ's nativity than about the day. This uncertainty as to which one of the two days (the 25th of December or the 6th of January) is Jesus' true birthday was unquestionably the cause of the sanctification of the so-called twelve nights, whereby each party gained its cause.

The antiquity of the custom of bestowing Christmas presents, is proved neither by the quoted history of Bishop Nicolas* nor by the testimonies, borrowed from Ambrose and Maximus, who speak only of certain alms, hospitality and other works of love, which were customary with the Christians, not only on Christmas, but on all other festivals and at other meetings.

Finally, there is so little similarity between the presents, with which the Romans were to appear before their emperors, on their birth-days, and the Christmas presents, that it is almost impossible to derive the latter from the former. The emperors would not have considered it as a peculiar sign of respect, if, on such days, their subjects had made presents only to their own children, on pretence that they did it in honor of their princes. The birth-day presents were imperial revenues, and belonged to those onerous taxes, of which the Romans used to complain, while the Christmas gifts, that are distributed only among the children and the members of the family, to afford them pleasure, are of an entirely different character.

In our opinion the celebration of Christmas first came into general use at Rome, in the fourth century.† This fact has been established so conclusively by the learned Dr. Ittig,‡ that we may regard it as generally acknowledged. The ancient Church Almanacs and Martyrologies showing that the Romish Church has endeavored to fix precisely the days on which memorable ecclesiastical events had occurred, we must suppose that she considered it her duty to inquire into the precise day of the birth of our Saviour, and that, in consequence of her investigations, she was finally convinced that it must necessarily fall on one of the last days of December. This opinion, as it appears from Chrysostom's afore-quoted discourse,§ was founded on the assumption that Zacharias, the father of John the Baptist, at the time when the angel of the Lord

* This somewhat mythical man, of whom little more than his name is known, lived, according to Tilenont's presumption, not in the fourth century but in a later period. Herzog X, p. 350. Article Nikolaus von Myra.

† Guericke's *Lehrbuch der Christlich Kirchlichen Archæologie*, p. 205.

‡ Th. Ittig *De ritu festum nativ. Christi die 25th Dec. celebrandi, ejusque antiquitate dissertat.* III.

§ Chrysostom *Ibid.* 423.

announced to him the conception of his son, was in the Holy of Holies, there, as a high priest, to burn incense and to sprinkle the blood of the offering round about the Mercy-seat, according to the divine commandment.* As this could take place only once a year, on the day of atonement, that is to say at the end of September, it was supposed that the conception of John the Baptist took place at this time, and that consequently his birth occurred on the end of the month of June. And as our Saviour was unquestionably born six months after John, the calculation appeared quite correct, that his birth-day must fall on one of the last days of December, on about the 25th of this month.

This statement contains several errors :

First, it is incorrect that Zacharias was a high priest, since the Scripture calls him a priest of the course of Abia †

In the second place, it is incorrect that he was in the Holy of Holies, when the angel of the Lord appeared to him, for he executed the priest's office before God, in the order of his course, ‡ when it was his turn to burn incense, all of which was not the high priest's duty, but that of a common priest §

Finally the angel, that appeared to him, stood not near the ark of the covenant, or the mercy seat, but at the right hand of the altar of incense, whose place was not in the Holy of Holies, but in the Holy place (*sanctus*) before the veil ¶

Notwithstanding these errors and inaccuracies, we must infer from the day of the conception of John, that Jesus was most probably born in the month of December, for the priests of the course of Abia, to which Zacharias belonged and which was the eighth in the order **, had to do service from the 15th to the 22d of September. It is in this month that the conception of John took place, which Bengel fixed on the 27th of September (!) and therefore the conception of Jesus must have occurred in March and his birth in December, as it is stated in the Martyrologies. ††

* Exod. 30 : 10 ; Lev. 1 : 5 ; Heb. 9 : 7, 25.

† Luke 1 : 5.

‡ Luke 1 : 8 ff.

§ Exod 30 : 7.

¶ Exod. 30 : 8.

** 1 Chron. 24 : 10.

†† Exstat sane apud Bucherium in doctrina temporum, fragmentum

In the season in which, according to the calculation, just mentioned, Christmas occurred, the *Saturnalia* were celebrated. At the beginning only one day was dedicated to this festival, viz: the 19th of December, but later when by the improvement of the calendar, the *Satur* made by Julius Cæsar, this month was increased by two additional days, the *Saturnalia* were celebrated two days earlier, that is to say on the 17th of December, and extended to the three whole days which were devoted to divine worship, and so it continued under the reign of Augustus,* but as to the conquests, spectacles and rejoicings they lasted much longer. Caligula added, according to Suetonius†, one day and, according to Dio Cassius,‡ two days more, called *Dies Juvenales*. The *Sigillaria*, which were considered as being a part of the *Saturnalia*, were celebrated as many days. These three festivals lasted, according to Macrobius,§ seven days and the end of these coincided nearly with the beginning of Christmas.

Roman catholic writers acknowledge that the Christians did not scruple at retaining heathen customs, putting however a Christian construction upon them. Baronius|| and Polydorus Vergilius** explicitly admit this fact, which moreover they could not deny. Eusebius,†† who had witnessed such adaptations under Constantine the Great, having stated that many pagan ceremonies had been adopted to induce thereby the heathen to adopt Christianity. These acknowledgments justify our belief, that the same has taken

veteris Romanorum Calendarii, tempore Constantii imp. et Liberii papæ scripti, in quo leguntur verba: viii, Kal. Januariæ natus est Christus in Bethlehem Juda. Modern researches also lead to the same result that the birth of Christ occurred at the end of the year. Compare Ideler Chronologie Vol. ii, p. 399 ff. F. Münter der Stern der Weisen. Copenhagen, 1826. G. Seyffarth's Chronologia Sacra, Leipzig, 1846, and the same author's summary of recent discoveries in Biblical Chronology, etc. New York, 1857, p. 18 ff.

*Lips. Saturn. Serm. Libr. I, cap. 3.

†Suetonius Calig. cap. 17. Ut lætitiæ in perpetuum augeret diem adjecit Saturnalibus, appellavitque Juvenalem.

‡LIX, c. b. τὰ τε χρόνια ἐπὶ, πέντε ἡμέρας ἱερτάζεσθαι κελεύσας.

§Macrobius Saturnalia I. 10. Licet et apud veteres opinio fuerit septem diebus peragi Saturnalia; si opinio vocanda est quæ idoneis firmatur auctoribus.

||Annal. eccles. ad annum XXXVI.

**De rerum inventoribus. Lib. V, c. 1.

††De laudibus Constant. Cap. 18.

place in reference to Christmas, and that the Christians of these early times had retained in the celebration of Christmas divers practices of the heathen in their Saturnalia, one of which was the custom of giving presents.*

To the further elucidation of our idea we shall make a few observations. Nobody denies that at the Christmas festival, lights were used very profusely, and that the Churches, especially during the vigils and the matins, were illumined by many hundred tapers. The room, in which the Christmas presents are given to the children, is even now every where illumined. There are very often among the Christmas presents tapers, which in some places, the children bring to Church to increase the number of lights. All this the heathen used to observe very strictly in the celebration of their Saturnalia, for, then, they not only illumined every place, but, according to the statement of Macrobius,† who gives the minutest account of this festival, they presented one another with tapers as an expression of good feeling.

This festival being celebrated in commemoration of the freedom and equality that existed among the inhabitants of the earth during the golden reign of Saturn it was further customary with the Romans that, in order to represent, during this festival, the golden age, the slaves were allowed their freedom‡ from their masters by whom they were most handsomely entertained, and even served at table§. The Christians imitated also this custom, for Polydorus Vergilius|| states that, still in his time (he lived from 1470 to 1555) the servants in England were permitted to command their masters on Christmas, and elected one of their number as master, whom every one in the house was obliged to obey during this festival. Paul

*Guerike Lehrbuch der christlich kirchlichen Archæologie, p. 212, Note 2. Monhart Die Sonn-Fest-und Heiligen-Tage der christlichen Kirche p. 132 ff.

†Saturnalia, Lib. I, c. 7.

‡A custom, which if we are not mistaken, prevails to a certain extent in the Southern States.

§Athæneus Dipnosoph, libr. XIV.

||De rerum inventoribus, lib. I, cap. 2. Est et illud a Romanis ad posterum profectum: quam ob rem nunc per dominica natalitia nostri ministri potestatem in dominos habeant, atque unus eorum dominus orietur cui cuncti domestici simul lascivi et bilares pareant. Institutum hoc apud Anglos præcipue custoditur.

Jovius states that the Marquis del Vasti celebrated Christmas at Milan in the manner of the Roman Saturnalia.*

The principal feature of this heathen festival was the exchange of presents,† and Suetonius relates that the emperors Caesar Augustus and Vespasian favored their friends with presents on the festival of Saturn.‡ They were called *apophoreta* and consisted, according to Martialis,§ of tablets, paper boxes, draught boards, dice, nuts, plumes, ink-stands, purses, rings, tooth-picks, hair-pins, combs, fans, hunting utensils, swords, tapers, chandeliers, sweetmeats, fruit, etc., which gifts, generally accompanied with humorous verses, were sent to absent friends or distributed among those present while at table. We see here the very prototype of the Christmas presents, which did not consist of alms, bestowed upon the poor and needy, but of such things as were pointed out in the above-quoted 14th Book of Martialis, wherewith each one endeavored to rejoice the heart of his wife, children and relatives.

We think we have shown that the origin of this custom, must be traced back to the Roman Saturnalia, from which it was most probably borrowed. Polydorus Vergilius,|| Hospinian,** Gisbert, Voetius,†† Calov,‡‡ and other scholars have long ago expressed this idea, which not having been properly elucidated, met with much contradiction.

In conclusion we quote the view entertained in this respect by a modern scholar. Dr. Guericke says :§§ "The Christian religious construction, which could be put upon the Saturnalia, served to the further illustration of the idea which lay at the foundation of the Christmas festival. It is true that many originally heathenish things, which received a Christian interpretation could, in the course of

*Hist. libr. XXXVIII. Vastius Mediolani veterum Saturnaliorum more natalitia Dei Christi celebravit.

†The Sigillaria, celebrated after the Saturnalia of which they were so to say an integral part, were called so from the little earthen ware figures given to children as presents. New American Cyclopædia, Vol. XIV, p. 361, Art. Saturnalia.

‡Suetonius, Cæsar Augustus, cap. 79, Vespasianus cap. 19.

§Martialis Epigram, XIV.

||De rerum inventoribus, Lib. V, 2.

**De Fest. cap. 2.

††Disputationes theologicæ, Vol. II, p. 49.

‡‡Ritual. evangel. part II. Fest II, cap. 16, 73, p. 271.

§§Guericke Lehrbuch der christlich kirchlichen archæologie, p. 212.

time, easily pass over into the celebration of Christmas. The Christian Church adopted forms foreign to herself, but transformed and sanctified them by the new spirit which she infused into them. That is especially the case not only with the usual lighting of tapers on the Saturnalia and the Jewish Encœnia, which were sent as presents to one another and to which the origin of the Christmas trees with their beautiful Christian meaning is to be traced, but also with the entertainments prepared for the slaves and with the *presents made to adults and to children*, emblematic of Is. 9 : 2 ; Luke 2 : 10 ; Matt. 2 : 11 ; Is. 52 : 13 ff ; Phil. 2 : 7 ; Rom. 8 : 32.

ARTICLE VII.

ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA.

By E. GREENSWALD, D. D., Easton, Pa.

"BUT a certain man named Ananias, with Sapphira his wife, sold a possession, and kept back part of the price, (his wife being privy to it,) and brought a certain part, and laid it at the apostles' feet. But Peter said, Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not thine own? And after it was sold was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thy heart? Thou hast not lied unto men but unto God. And Ananias, hearing these words, fell down and gave up the Ghost. And great fear came on all them that heard these things." Acts 5 : 1—5.

We have here the narration of an occurrence that is sometimes thought to be very cruel, and that does not receive, in the pulpit, the attention that it deserves. It is related in direct connection with what was stated concerning a large-hearted and liberal Christian, Barnabas by name, in the closing verse of the preceding chapter. Being under the influence of the grace of God, and participating, as all ought, in the benevolent spirit of the gospel, Barnabas sold some of his land, and laid the purchase

money at the feet of the apostles, *i. e.*, he paid it over to them in order that with it, the necessities of the poor Christians might be relieved, and the cause of Christianity in general, might be promoted. Others were, no doubt, induced to imitate his example, and a general spirit of benevolence was the habit of the Church. A man named Ananias, who was also a Christian convert, and a member of the infant Church, having property, felt also inclined to acquire a reputation for liberality and benevolence. He sold, with the knowledge and consent of his wife, a piece of land, of which he was the owner, a lot, or "possession" as it is here termed. This, of course, he had the right to do, and he had, at the same time, the right to dispose of the money, as he pleased. But here commenced the wrong and untruthfulness of his conduct. He retained, or kept back, a part, how large a part is not said, perhaps the larger part, of the purchase money, and the remainder he brought to the apostles, and in the presence of the assembled congregation of Christians, laid it at their feet, and represented to them that what he here paid over, was the whole of the money which he had received for that land. In this procedure—in the false statement as to the amount, and in the purpose to deceive—both the man and his wife perfectly understood one another. The motive that prompted to this act of falsehood and deception, appeared to be the desire to acquire the same reputation for benevolence and self-denial for the good of others and the welfare of the Church, which they saw that Barnabas and others had acquired by their sincere and truthful offerings made on behalf of the Church and the poor.

It appears that after the sale of their land, this unhappy pair were influenced by avarice, to retain the money. They could part with the land, but their hearts clung much more tenaciously to the gold. But it was not this, in which their offence consisted. They might have retained their land, and not have sold it at all; and after it was sold they might have retained the money, and no one would have found the least fault with them on that account. Avarice, of course, is wrong, and the Scriptures continually warn against it, but it was not for the sin of covetousness, proper, that they were so signally punished. They concealed their love for money, and offered the part, as if it were the whole, directly so represented it, and this, not privately to a single apostle, but publicly, before the whole congrega-

tion, and in the house of God. It was a deliberate misrepresentation for the purpose of being reputed large-hearted and self-denying. They were actuated by the low motive of having their brethren applaud them as being noble examples of liberal Christians who would sacrifice their all for the poor and for the interests of the gospel, whilst they did not give their all, and lied in so representing it. It was hypocrisy in its basest and worst form. In this conduct they uttered a base lie, conscious all the while their lips were uttering it, that it was a falsehood that they uttered. It was at the same time a falsehood uttered against God, in the house of God, in an offering to God, a falsification of what was laid on the altar of God, and, therefore, an offence, not so much against the poor, as against the God of the poor. As they declared in the most public manner, that the full price belonged to the Church, and was given to it, they, by withholding a part, were guilty, by their own showing, of the crime of embezzling sacred funds. In this whole case, there was the element of the greatest danger to the sanctity of the Church, for such deception, if successful, would be likely to taint others, and with the departure from purity and truthfulness on the part of its members, the Church of Jesus Christ was threatened with the loss of its chief ornament, and Pharasaic hypocrisy which had been the curse of the Jewish Church, would take the place of the strict integrity, and genuine holiness, by which Christ intended that his Church should always be distinguished. It was indispensably necessary, therefore, that the great corruption should be arrested at its very beginning. It was necessary to avoid a false step at this early stage, and guard against tolerating actions, that would give a false character to Christianity in all future time. No mind can conceive the direful effects that would have sprung from the toleration of such falsehood, hypocrisy, embezzlement of sacred funds, and corruption of heart and life, in the person of a prominent member of the infant Church.

On the first day of the week, when the Church were assembled for divine service, and for the holy sacrament of breaking of bread, and at the time when the offerings were called for and presented, Ananias, with the consciousness of corruption in his heart, but with the solemnity of innocence in his face, advanced to the altar where the apostles

sat, with money in his hand; and represented that he had sold his piece of land, and now, out of love to the poor, to the Church, and to Christ, he would make the great personal sacrifice, reduce himself to poverty, and lay the whole of it, as an offering to the Lord. He expected either words of commendation from the apostles' lips, or at least, the applause of the Christian congregation around him, for his great act of self-denial. What was his surprise and consternation on the contrary, when the apostle Peter solemnly arose, and fastening his eyes upon the guilty culprit, uttered in the hearing of the whole congregation, these burning words: "Ananias, why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost, and to keep back part of the price of the land? While it remained, was it not thine own? and after it was sold, was it not in thine own power? Why hast thou conceived this thing in thine heart? Thou hast not lied unto men, but unto God?"

These were startling and terrible words. How must the guilty hypocrite have trembled in every limb, and how must the whole congregation have started to their feet in astonishment, both at the unexpected deception, and at the boldness of the apostle Peter in rebuking it!

How the apostle knew of the deception, attempted to be practiced by Ananias and his wife, we are not informed. He may have acquired the knowledge, by being informed by others of the sale of the property and of the full price that had been obtained for it, and thus obtained it by natural and ordinary means. But as his address to Ananias and his wife intimated not only his knowledge of the external transaction, but also of the motives and state of heart of those parties, it was no doubt, by divine inspiration, that he spoke on this occasion.

Now, what is the meaning of this pointed rebuke? It is observable, at the outset, that his address has the form of a question: "Why hath Satan filled thy heart to lie to the Holy Ghost?" He brought the man to the bar of his own consciousness. He made him the judge of his own case. He would have him pronounce his own sentence. He asks: Why did you, a professed Christian, allow the devil to have possession of your heart? Such falsehood and corruption are the suggestions of the devil alone. That he has filled your heart, proves that God and all good, are banished thence, and Satan has entire control of you. He hath filled thy heart "to lie to the Holy

Ghost." Your guilt is the guilt of lying. You are both telling and acting a lie. You know that you are uttering what is not true. You here solemnly, in the presence of this congregation declare, that what you have here offered, is the whole amount obtained from the sale of your land, when you in your heart know that it is false, and that you are uttering a lie. Moreover, this lie is uttered, not to man alone, but to the Holy Ghost. It is bad enough if it were simply an offence against men. But in sinning and lying to men, you sin against God, for all sin is a transgression of his law. But this is especially an offence against the Holy Ghost, because the dispensation of the Spirit has just commenced, he is poured out visibly upon the disciples, they speak and act by his inspiration, the lie is uttered in the house of God, in the presence of the congregation, and in the very face of the Holy Ghost. It is therefore aggravated in the highest degree, and is a lie to the Holy Ghost and to God. It is a gross perversion of religion. You wish to acquire the reputation of charity by sacrificing truth. In order to be considered benevolent, you become a liar.

He proceeds to explain that the lie he uttered was without excuse, and that the offence did not consist in his refusal to donate the whole of his property. He might perhaps, have felt that the apostles were greedy of large offerings, and desired all his money, and that because he did not give it all, therefore he was denounced. The evil heart would, be very likely thus to pervert the nature of the apostles' address. For the purpose of preventing such a false construction, he proceeds to say, that Ananias was at perfect liberty either to give or retain the money, and if he gave any, to give either the whole or a part, as he might choose, but that his crime consisted in his lying about it. "While it remained was it not thine own?" *i. e.* While the land was unsold, was it not at thy disposal, and wast thou not at liberty to sell or to keep it? There was no necessity to sell it. No one directed, or required, or wanted you to sell it. You might have kept it, and yet be guilty of no wrong. "And after it was sold, was it not in thine own power?" *i. e.* after you had sold the land, the money was yours. You might have done what you pleased with it. You might have given the whole, or a part, or none at all. It was a free will offering, and you were at perfect liberty to do as you pleased about it. No

man would have had a right to say a word on the subject, whatever might have been the disposition which you made of your own property. Your offence does not consist in giving or not giving your property. But the offence consists in the lie you tell about it; in the solemn assertion, that this money is the whole, when both you and your wife know that it is not the whole. You are guilty of gross and deliberate misrepresentation and falsehood. It is an aggravated lie, because you have uttered it in the most solemn manner and at the very altar of God. You have done this thing from the base motive of appearing what you are not, of acquiring a reputation for great self-sacrifice which is false. Your crime is a great and aggravated offence against God, and the purity and reputation of the Christian Church. The gospel is truth, and requires pure and godlike truthfulness from all that profess it. Your crime, if it prevailed extensively, would sap the very foundation of the gospel; would spread seething corruption over the Church, would make Christians worse even than the hypocritical Pharisees of the Jewish Church, and would nullify the whole effort and object of the gospel in purifying and sanctifying men.

So far the apostle Peter. He intended to rebuke a vile lie for the benefit and warning of the culprit and of the Church. Here, no doubt, he supposed it would end, with this act of necessary discipline. But at this point a higher power than Peter took the case in hand. No sooner were these words of Peter uttered, than Ananias grew pale, his feet tottered beneath him, he staggered a step or two forward, and then sank down on the floor, and after a gasp or two for breath, he was a lifeless corpse. Peter did not kill him. It is commonly thought that Peter, by an effort of miraculous power, produced his death. But the narrative says no such thing. Peter was, no doubt, as much startled at what followed his words, as were the frightened congregation. It was God that killed him. In order to produce such an impression as would last for all time, and stop a source of corruption at the beginning, which, if suffered to go on, would corrupt the whole character of Christianity, and in order to make men feel that a God of truth requires perfect truthfulness in those that belong to his Church, God struck down this guilty man and his wife, in the very act of perpetrating their crime. It was a most solemn moment. Well is it said, that "fear

came on all those that heard and saw it." They must have felt, in that hour, the importance of truthfulness, as they never felt it before. Neither could they ever forget the lesson. And its effect continues to this time, in the abhorrence which men everywhere almost instinctively feel towards religious hypocrisy and lying.

What, now, are the results of this examination of this case?

1. This passage is not so difficult as has been supposed. It does not reflect dishonorably upon the character of God, or of the apostle Peter, as many think, nor does it justify the repugnance which they feel concerning it. The brief attention which we have given it, will serve to show how plain and simple a case it is.

2. Ananias and Sapphira his wife were not killed, because they did not give the whole of their property to the Church. This was not their offence. They might have retained every penny of it, and have committed no crime. They were punished for something, altogether different.

3. Peter did not kill Ananias. It is not so said here. He only did his duty as a faithful minister. He sharply rebuked sin. He called a wicked and unworthy member of the Church to account. He exposed his hypocrisy to the view of others, for their warning, and for the preservation of the purity of the Church. If nothing serious had followed to the life of the offender, no person would ever have thought of finding any fault with his words. What he said was eminently proper, and richly deserved.

4. God took the life of a guilty man. He that gave life has the right to take it again. He has the right to take it, in his own time and way. In punishment for sin, he declared and gave notice that he would take it; for this cause he is taking it now, and indeed in every case of death, for all death is the result of sin, and if men had never sinned they would never die. He has distinctly said: "The mouth of them that speak lies shall be stopped." The Psalmist declares: "Thou shalt destroy them that speak leasing," *i. e.*, lying. "There shall in no wise enter into heaven any thing that maketh a lie." When God stopped the lying tongue of Ananias, and destroyed the false mouth of Sapphira, he only fulfilled what, more than a thousand years before, he declared he would do.

5. The death of these people was not for a small or insignificant offence. Truth is the foundation of all moral-

ity and religion. On its observance, depend all the justice, the order, the security, the property, the happiness, the lives, of men. If it is overthrown everything else is destroyed. The gospel, especially, is the truth of God, and a lie is aimed at its very pillars. If Ananias' lie had been passed over, and had infected by its baneful example, the infant Christian Church, no language could describe the disastrous effects. As the Jewish Church, and the whole Gentile population were habitual deceivers, hypocrites, and liars, and the entire character of the people was rotten in untruth, God would make an example at the very threshold of the Christian Church, that would make an impression that would endure for all time. Its effects have been most beneficial. We feel it to this day, and it will be felt as long as the world stands.

6. Christianity is pure and holy, and must be so maintained. No transaction, recorded in the Bible, teaches more strikingly than this, the high estimate which should be placed on perfect sincerity and truthfulness, by all who bear the Christian name. God would have the Church pure. He hates every false way. He sees the heart and knows its spirit and purposes. He will bring every thought into judgment. For every word we must render an account. Clear and pure as crystal, with no stain or shade, should the hearts of all Christians be. As all things lie open and naked before the eye of Him, with whom we have to do, we should be very careful that that eye sees nothing but what is perfectly truthful there.

ARTICLE VIII.

JOHN'S MESSAGE. MATT. 11 : 3.

By Prof. J. F. WILKEN, Gettysburg, Pa.

COMMENTATORS of the Holy Scriptures commonly consider it a difficult task, to reconcile the Message of John, the Baptist, to our Saviour: "Art thou he, that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. 11 : 3) with the declaration of the Saviour himself, respecting the charac-

ter of the Baptist, (Matt. 11 : 8—11.) How often has it happened, *qui vitet Scyllam incidit in Charybdim*, and while vindicating the veracity of the Searcher of hearts and of the King of truth, men have pressed the words of John, until they have left no meaning at all; while others, sustaining the wavering faith of John, expressed by his message, come into open conflict with the Saviour himself. And when even from the pulpit we hear John's example presented to illustrate and corroborate the truth of the phenomenon, that also men, strongest in faith, have their dark, wavering hours we feel sorry to see the character of John impeached, and the Saviour contradicted, at the same time. The sincere desire of removing these difficulties, has given origin to the present article, and as the question is not only interesting to the interpreter, but is, also, of practical importance, I hope that I shall not apply in vain to the reader's indulgence, for directing his attention to the subject.

Interpreting the Holy Scriptures, as any other work, we cannot be cautious enough in avoiding the current error of introducing our own ideas into the text, instead of drawing our system of doctrines from the well-understood text. But, besides a close attention to grammatical rules and lexicographical definitions, there is nothing that so much aids, in leading to the true understanding of a sentence, as a careful consideration of the circumstances, under which it was spoken, and which was the occasion of its expression. As the explanation of the words of the whole section in view involves no difficulty, we shall have to apply to that second mode of overcoming difficulties in understanding the subject, and by a brief sketch of the life of John, and of that peculiar position, which he occupied in the *œconomia salutis*, between the two dispensations of the Old and New Testament, we shall reach that point, which gave origin to the message from his prison, and to that disposition, which was uttered by the question laid before the Saviour, in order to get his answer.

According to the flesh, John the Baptist was the son of Zacharias and Elizabeth, both his parents being of the tribe of Levi, born in the town of Jutta, in the hilly section of the tribe of Judah, six months older than the Saviour himself. According to the spirit, according to the dispensation of the Father of Mercy, he was the voice of one crying in the wilderness, Make straight the way of

the Lord, as said the prophet Esaias, (John 1 : 23); according to the spirit, he was the messenger of the covenant, spoken of by the prophet Malachi (cf. Matt. 11 : 10), and even the prophet Elias, or Jeremias, or that prophet, *i. e.*, that prophet to be expected in order to prepare the way of the Lord. Although John himself, when asked by the Pharisees, denied the latter, as he was not, indeed, Elias in the sense of the question of the Pharisees, who expected a bodily resurrection of Elias before the advent of the Messiah, yet it was affirmed by the Saviour himself, that he was Elias, in a spiritual sense. For all these epithets, given to the Baptist, concur in the one point, that he was appointed by an over-ruling Providence in representing the claims of the divine law, its inexorable demands and the unavoidable consequences of transgression, to stir up the consciousness of sin, cherished as enmity against a holy and just Father, in order to drive the conscience-smitten heart to the throne of Mercy, for the purpose of securing the salvation, offered by the "Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world."

And how wonderfully did John accomplish this peculiar task! Although his father Zacharias, being a member of the eighth class of priests, whose duty it was to burn incense, when their turn came to go to Jerusalem and to officiate in the temple of the Lord, was not only highly respected, but was in the most favorable circumstances, as we may learn from different facts, connected with John's birth and circumcision, yet John voluntarily deprived himself of this high position, to which he was entitled by birth, and of the comforts of life which he might have enjoyed within the hereditary rank of his ancestors. Neither turning a Pharisee, who endeavored to prove his orthodoxy by a minute observance of the ceremonial law, and an ostentatious exhibition of outward piety; nor a Sadducee, who studied liberal principles and was conversant in negations as were most suited to their licentious mode of living; nor even an Anachorite, (Essenes,) who, despising the world, withdrew totally from the contamination of human society, John chose for his abode the wilderness, on the banks of Jordan; clothed with camel's hair (not mohair, made from the wool of the Angora goat) and a girdle of skin about his loins, he did eat locusts, roasted and cured with wild honey, which, without money, he found in the woods, choosing the clothing and the fare of the

poorest people in the Orient, in order that he might, by his example, preach in opposition to the luxury of his age, with how little nature is content, without asking them to follow him to such an extreme, what he also preached in words to all the land of Judea, that resorted to him, even the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins. As Diogenes of old, by disgust of the luxuriousness of his age, was driven to the utmost simplicity in his mode of living, so John the Baptist, who, for a long time, as an eye-witness, had observed that man seeks to cover his unworthiness by outward splendor, and that to secure the desired means, luxury is avaricious, and avarice is the root of all evil, devised his plan of crushing the serpent's head. And he found the wished for opportunity, when not only the whole land of Judea, even publicans and soldiers, went to him, but the Pharisees from Jerusalem sent an official message, and even King (rather Tetrarch) Herod, with his splendid retinue, made his appearance before this burning and shining light, willing for a season to rejoice in his light, to satisfy his curiosity and to be pleasantly entertained.

It has been always considered the most difficult problem in theology, to reconcile the sovereignty of God and the freedom (*liberum arbitrium*) of man. Both of them are accomplished facts, and cannot be denied by any reasonable creature, and any solution of the problem, laying too much stress upon one side of the question at the expense of the other, is injurious to the truth, and misleads, either to the all-human doctrine of moral responsibility, or to the all-providential blessing of an almighty, wise and merciful Father, annihilating Pantheism and Atheism. As an all-preserving and ruling Providence must be considered in the light of a continual creation, so that Supreme Being, who has the faculty of creating free creatures, has also the faculty of governing free creatures; but while he, in his sovereignty, has a view of totality, no short-sighted beings are only able to take in, at once, either one side or the other of an object in view. Yet, although the wicked are acting at their own option, and are responsible for their doings, they do not enjoy their liberty, and abusing it and ruining themselves, they accomplish, without knowing it, and involuntarily, as instruments of the Supreme Power, the grand projects of our Heavenly Father.

So the sons of Jacob acted on their own accord, selling their brother Joseph into slavery and captivity, but became, by an over-ruling Providence, the instrumentalities of elevating him to the throne of Egypt and saving a country from famine and misery. So the Jews, not bearing that burning light, in which they saw their iniquities, and endeavoring to extinguish it, that they might not any more be compelled to look upon their own perversity, acted voluntarily by condemning the Fountain of Life to death; but as instrumentalities of our gracious Father, they fulfilled his eternal decree, to glorify his only begotten Son, whom he raised from the dead, and to save a world lost in sin, through faith in the atonement of the blood of our blessed Redeemer. Hence, although the liberty of choosing the blessing or the curse, is unimpaired even in the wicked, yet only those are truly free, whom the Son makes free, and who, through the faith in Jesus, delivered from guilt and the fetters of sin, unmoved by the spirit of God's children, by the spirit of grateful love, not only choose voluntarily, what is the Father's good pleasure, and submit humbly and cheerfully to his administration, but delight in his will and feel, as our Saviour did, when he said: "My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work."

Applying the general principle, we have here developed, to the history of John, we would state, considering the human side of his fate, that for his intrepidity with which he spoke the truth, and for that great benefit he bestowed upon King Herod, by pointing out to him his sin to lead him to repentance, he was put to prison by the offender, who was offended, and put to death by the interference of Herodias, who, being the wife of Philip, had married Herod, while her first husband was yet alive, and took advantage of Herod's inconsiderate promise to her daughter, to punish John's boldness with death. Considering the other side of his fate, we would say, that after he had served out his time, had fulfilled all righteousness appointed to him, his public preaching preceding the Saviour's six months, and after he had introduced the Lamb of God into the world through his baptism, John, like the morning star, that announces the dawn of the day, but gently fades after the rising of the glorious sun, conscious himself of his inferior position, and gladly confessing that "He must increase, but I must decrease," was removed to a happier abode,

and received thereby the plaudit: "Well done, faithful servant, enter into the joy of thy Lord!"

When John was yet in prison, he had the privilege of the attendance of those of his disciples who had not as yet followed his advice, to leave him and become disciples of the Lord. King Herod, who respected him, who often asked his advice, deprived him not of this comfort, which John shared with Socrates, before drinking that fatal cup. Although the King felt sorry, yet, in order not to be disgraced in the eyes of those that were with him, when he promised Salome to give her whatsoever she would ask, he complied with her mother's request. How fickle human nature is! Was that also true of John, when he sent from prison his message to the Lord? Was his faith in the Saviour ever shaken, and did he express his doubt in that question, presented to the Lord? *A priori* we feel inclined to deny it. It is not likely, that a man like John would be moved. He understood too fully and clearly the position, assigned to him through the prophets of old, and the angel, announcing his birth. Filled with awful adoration, he preached τὸν ἐρχόμενον, the prophesied and expected Messiah, whose shoes' latchet he felt not worthy to unloose, before he knew him. "I knew him not," as the Messiah, before the baptism; for as the mother of John and Jesus were relations and intimate friends, it is not likely that they were not acquainted with one another.

After the baptism of the Lord, he heard the voice from heaven: "Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased," and immediately he pointed him out to his disciples, as "the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world." When the disciples, remaining with John, filled with envy, reported his success in the hyperbolic expression, "All men come to him," he himself testifying his joy, exclaimed: "He that has the bride (Church) is the bridegroom: but the friend of the bridegroom, which standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth greatly because of the bridegroom's voice; this my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase and I must decrease." And not at all satisfied with the present success, he expresses his feelings by a hyperbolic enunciation of the opposite extreme: "No man receiveth his testimony." Who dares first, to cast a stone at such a sublime type of truth and humility! We, indeed, admit, that even the strongest in faith have their dark hours; but if, although reluctantly, we would include

John in this number, we cannot do it, without defying the testimony of the Searcher of hearts and of the King of truth, wherewith he has honored the memory of John and defended his character against any aggressor, so that he stands unstained through all ages: "What went ye out into the wilderness to see? A reed shaken with the wind?" Does that question not indicate, that John's faith is like the eternal rocks of the ocean, not moved by storms and waves: "What went ye out for to see? A man clothed in soft raiment? behold, they that wear soft clothing are in king's house." A man, that despises worldly greatness and deprives himself of the comforts of life for the welfare of his fellow men, cannot, as King Herod did, be moved by hope and fear, to express himself, or to act in contradiction with his better feelings and persuasion.

But admitting the sufficiency of these arguments, how shall we avoid the dilemma, intowhich we are led by the question of the Baptist. We could take our refuge in this, or that hypothesis, excluding all doubt, but we do not intend to detain the reader's attention, with what has been so often attempted without giving perfect satisfaction. Hypothesis is always an unsafe guide in darkness. And we need not apply ourselves to any unsafe guide, as we have the safest we may desire, the interpretation of our Saviour himself, contained in the answer, which he sent back to John. John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, and even these works, which filled the whole land with such awe and astonishment, that the rumor reached the lonely castle Machaerus, in which John was incarcerated, were the occasion that urged John to send his message, to ask the question; and our Saviour referring, also, to his works, "The blind receive their sight," etc., (both bodily and spiritually) in his answer, expresses this thought: What thou hast heard is correct, and that is my way; and blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me, shall be satisfied with my mode of fulfilling the labors *του επροκειμενου*, of the prophesied Messiah. Hence, comparing this answer to John with the testimony respecting John to the people, it appears that the Saviour took the proposed question in this sense, that, although John's faith was unshaken, yet he was not satisfied with the ways and means, by which the Saviour accomplished his task; he expected, besides what he had heard, something else, something more. And this is the very thing John ex-

presses by his question : *Σὺ εἰ ὁ ἐρχόμενος, ἢ ἕτερον προσδοκῶμεν* ; a question which, changed in an affirmative sentence, would read : Thou art he that should come, we do not look for another ; how then is it, that the promises of old are not totally fulfilled ? But here occurs a double question : What was it that John expected, and that the Saviour cut off by the second clause of the answer : "Blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me ? and, why was John under the impression that he had a right to ask this bold question ? We may be permitted to make here a digression, in order to put the whole affair of John's message in a full light, and to find a satisfactory explanation for both questions.

Time and space are attributes of alterable things, hence they cannot be attributes of the invisible God, which we are accustomed to express by the words, *eternal* and *omnipresent*. This is alluded to so correctly by Augustine : *Deus creavit mundum et tempus*. Time and space having no reality in the essence of God, the question of the Atheists, What did God before the creation of the world ? is a very unreasonable one, and attempts to draw down the Father of lights into the boundaries of human flesh, whose thinking and reasoning is circumscribed by the laws of nature, the laws of time and space. But if the Father of mercy takes away this veil from our spiritual eye, then already in this life takes place what St. Paul hoped would, in our future existence : "Now we see through a glass, darkly, but then face to face ; now I know in part, but then shall I know, even as also I am known." Therefore, if the prophets are permitted to look into the eternal decrees of our Heavenly Father, and are commanded to reveal them to mankind, in order that they may believe, if those decrees be clothed with flesh and blood, in the fulfilment of time, then commonly they see the things in their supernatural appearance, without the limits of time and space. We do not speak here of the exceptions, that for good reasons took place, for instance, when the prophets announced the time and place of birth of our blessed Redeemer. And this totality of the view of the kingdom of heaven, which they took in, while transported above the boundaries of mortal imperfection into a state of spiritual vision, they displayed, also, when the outcast spirit's wing was furled, and backward to its dwelling driven, in their speeches to the people, as well as in their writings, pre-

serving eternal truth to following ages, that in the fulfilment of time they might perceive and acknowledge the dispensations of Providence in those affairs, which otherwise might seem to have their origin in human arbitrary developments. Considering this peculiar circumstance, we shall not be longer astonished, if we find in the prophecies of the Old Testament the three advents of the Lord. His first advent in flesh, his second advent in spirit, through the spreading of the gospel, and his third advent in judging the quick and the dead, not separated and through long intervening periods distinguished, but as if it were in one breath, in their totality closely connected, as one grand panorama of the Divine Dispensation. In the same manner, also, the Lord himself brings into close contact the judgment executed on Jerusalem and the final judgment of the world, (Matt. 24 and 25,) as one drama, exhibiting Divine justice, and it is, indeed, one and the same act of divine sovereignty, distinguished only by the succession of time in *our* apprehension, and divided in the different acts for our benefit, the first being the type of the second.

Returning now, after this digression, to John the Baptist, we find him standing with one foot on the sacred soil of ancient prophecy, being himself a prophet, and preaching Christ, that should come, *τὸν ἐρχόμενον*, and with the other foot on the threshold of the sanctuary of the New Testament, when Christ had come already in his holy temple, to fulfil in flesh all righteousness. He, taking in, with one general aspect all the prophetic features of Messiah, recognized in him, who was demonstrated and proved as the Son of God, beyond doubt, while being baptized and introduced into the world, as the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world, as well as the Judge of the quick and the dead. And being ordained as preacher unto repentance, he made even this last feature of Messiah his antecedent, revealing to those that came to his baptismal: "And now also the axe is laid unto the roots of the trees: therefore every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit, is hewn down and cast into the fire." With this part of the achievements of Messiah, John was not able to reconcile what the Saviour himself, distinguishing between his advent in flesh and his advent as Judge, declared by word and deed: "God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through him might be saved." Hence John in his message unto Christ, ex-

pressed his wonder and astonishment for seeing only one factor of the activity of Messiah accomplished, while the other factor, in his judgment, was neglected; and he thought himself to be entitled to that question, yea, he considered it his imperative duty, as he was conscious of standing upon the soil of divine truth, having proclaimed Christ, the Judge of the quick and the dead. But Christ, giving the Baptist the highest praises a human being may expect, and acknowledging the faithful accomplishment of the task assigned him, deemed it proper to cut short his importunate question, and pointing out the ways and means, by which his divine glory and authority were manifested and the world to be saved, and intimates to the Baptist, that those having acquired by divine grace unshaken faith in the divinity (divine nature) of Christ, ought also, in humility, to submit to the ways and means which he uses, in order to give them everlasting life, even if they feel not enabled themselves fully to comprehend his method of grace.

In conclusion, we refer to the declaration of Christ: "Verily I say unto you, among them that are born of women, there hath not risen a greater than John the Baptist, notwithstanding he that is least in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. The prophets of old were, indeed, the greatest of all men, admitted into the secret Cabinet of the Sovereign Ruler of the world, who had the eternal decrees communicated and expounded to them. John was, indeed, greater than they, for, being himself a prophet, he was also the object and fulfilment of their prophecies; and what they saw and heard in vision, he heard and saw bodily, and was permitted, although the inferior, to baptize the superior, and to introduce him into the world. But what he did not perceive, the development of the salvation of Christ, in the course of time, the least in the kingdom of heaven is enabled to perceive; and he that has not only an historical faith in Christ, but through his inward experience of the saving faith (*fides salvifica*) feels himself under obligation to show: "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God!" is happy through his faith, and his happiness is not to be disturbed by being offended in him, although he cannot fully understand and appropriate his ways and means. "And blessed is he, whosoever shall not be offended in me!" says the Lord, our blessed Redeemer.

ARTICLE IX.

THE GENERAL SYNOD AND HER ASSAILANTS.

By Prof. J. A. BROWN, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa.

No apology can be necessary for an attempt to set before the readers of the *Evangelical Review* some of the main facts connected with the efforts to disrupt and destroy the General Synod of the Lutheran Church in these United States. Notwithstanding the ample discussions in our religious papers, and before Synods, it is still the life question of our Church, in this age, and in this country. The persistent endeavors of the enemies of the General Synod to misrepresent her action, and her doctrinal position, before the Church and the world, and thus to prejudice those unacquainted with her history, makes it necessary for her friends to repel these attacks and to defend the truth. Were it not for the evils which in the meantime would be wrought, the whole question might be safely left to the calm judgment of coming generations.

As the difficulties in the General Synod have been chiefly with the Synod of Pennsylvania, and those Synods more recently influenced by her action, although it is claimed the causes lie deeper, and are far-reaching, it will be necessary to review the history of the Synod of Pennsylvania in connection with the General Synod. We desire, however, to say that it is not designed to charge all the members of that Synod with hostility to the General Synod, or with laboring in the work of destruction. Some are known to be friends of the General Synod, and to deprecate the unwise and violent action of their body, whilst it may be doubted if a majority of the ministers and members would sanction such a course, if left free to their own calm judgment and unbiased action. When we speak, therefore, of the Synod of Pennsylvania, we speak of her public, official action.

First Connection and Withdrawal.

The Synod of Pennsylvania participated in the original formation of the General Synod, and prominent among the

members appear the names of her delegates appended to the Constitution, adopted A. D., 1820. But though aiding in the formation and attending one convention of that body, when the next General Synod convened in 1823, the Synod of Pennsylvania was not represented. This was owing to disaffection on the part of some members of the Church, and the Synod so far yielded to their clamors as to resolve not to send delegates, until requested to do so by the Churches.

The Editor of the *Evangelical Review*, who has performed the work of a faithful historian of the General Synod, tells us:

"The opinion, in some quarters, prevailed that the General Synod would create a power in the Church for the exercise of ecclesiastical tyranny, replete with mischief, and most dangerous to the liberties of the American people." Also, that the withdrawal of the Synod of Pennsylvania, was owing to "the prejudices of the congregations, and the fears entertained by some of the ministers, that the General Synod would exercise too much authority, and invade the rights of the district Synods."*

Whilst many in the Synod favored the General Synod, there was no official connection between the General Synod and the Synod of Pennsylvania, for many years. Prejudice and bigotry ruled the hour. This state of things continued from 1823 until 1853. During this time the General Synod went forward in her mission, uniting a large number of Synods, founding Colleges and Seminaries, organizing benevolent Institutions, supplying, in some degree, a church literature, and in various ways greatly promoting the prosperity of the Church, and advancing the cause of Christ. This was the period of her peace and comparative prosperity.

The best men in the Synod of Pennsylvania, seeing the good accomplished by the General Synod, and lamenting their separation, earnestly labored to bring about a reunion. Much prejudice was encountered, and much opposition had to be overcome before this could be effected. It is proper to say that the opposition was not from an apprehension of the want of orthodoxy, or a want of power, but rather from a dread that the General Synod might exercise too much authority, or burden their con-

* *Evangelical Review*, Vol. V, pp. 239, 244.

sciences by too rigid a faith. The Synod of Pennsylvania, at that time, maintained the widest liberty, in faith and practice.

Reunion of the Synod of Pennsylvania with the General Synod.

After a separation from the General Synod for thirty years, and after discussion and reference to the churches, the Synod of Pennsylvania reunited with the General Synod, in 1853. It was an occasion of mutual rejoicing. The General Synod rejoiced to receive back again so large and influential a Synod. The Synod of Pennsylvania, or at least those who had labored for this end, rejoiced in again being in active coöperation with sister Synods. Much has been said about the feelings and wishes on both sides, but it is believed that the truth in the case is, that such was the mutual gratification that little attention was given to formalities. And had the same spirit animated the Synod of Pennsylvania, in 1864 and 1866, as in 1853, no division in the General Synod would have taken place at this time.

To satisfy some in the Synod of Pennsylvania, certain resolutions were adopted on reuniting with the General Synod. As these have been the subject of much comment, and made, by some, the basis of future action, the material one will here be given.

"Resolved, 4th. That we neither intend, nor ever expect, that the principles which have hitherto governed our Synod, in respect to Church doctrine and Church life, shall suffer any change, whatever, by our connection with the General Synod; but, that should the General Synod, as a condition of admission or of continuation of membership, require assent to any thing conflicting with the old and long established faith of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, then our delegates are hereby required to protest against such action, to withdraw from its sessions, and to report to this body."

There has been much difference of opinion as to the rights and privileges conferred by the resolutions, of which the one just quoted is the most important. Some have claimed for delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania the right to withdraw, without thereby affecting her relations with the General Synod, and nearly all who have sought to defend her course at Lancaster and Fort Wayne, have

adduced these resolutions in justification. But there are several difficulties in the way of the privileges claimed on her behalf by some of her defenders. First, there is no evidence that the General Synod ever consented to any such a compact. That she did not object to the reception of the Synod of Pennsylvania, can hardly be considered as decisive on this point; and there is no record to show that the General Synod entered into any such agreement. If the Synod of Pennsylvania considered it important, it was her business to see to the agreement, and that it was placed on the record. Then, even if the Synod of Pennsylvania had been received on such conditions, and these conditions mutually agreed to, they do not reach the point claimed. They only stipulate for the protest and withdrawal of the delegation, to report to the Synod of Pennsylvania, but do not stipulate that such action should in no way affect the relations of the Synod to the General Synod. It is absurd to suppose that any delegation could have the right to withdraw at pleasure, and to return at pleasure, just as if nothing had transpired. Even conceding the right to protest and withdraw, it might be for the General Synod to have a word to say when the delegation returned.

But what ought to settle this point, and remove it from all weight or influence in deciding this question, is the judgment of the Synod of Pennsylvania, clearly expressed. In the response of the delegation to the action of the General Synod, they distinctly declare that :

"The Synod simply expressed, in intelligible language, what every Synod in connection with the General Synod holds, as an undisputed, reserved right. Every synodical delegation has the right to protest, to withdraw, and to report to the body that sent it, * * and this is all that is claimed and required in the instructions referred to."

This response was endorsed and published by the Synod of Pennsylvania,* thus making it her own. The same views were reiterated, again and again, by their friends on the floor of the General Synod. Now it is time this matter should be understood: and if the Synod of Pennsylvania, and her friends, deny that she claimed or enjoyed any peculiar privileges, then let them not turn around and insist that the Synod of Pennsylvania had what they have

* Minutes of 1866, Appendix, p. 11.

just denied. Let there be some consistency in the case, and let them not at one time claim peculiar privileges, and at another deny and repudiate them. As the Synod of Pennsylvania has formally disclaimed any peculiar rights, and it cannot be shown that the General Synod ever recognized any such, it seems unnecessary to dwell longer on this point.

For eleven years the Synod of Pennsylvania was in union with the General Synod, and coöperated in the great work of the Church. But 1864 witnessed another movement, terminating in the entire separation of the Synod of Pennsylvania from the General Synod.

General Synod at York, 1864.

Here the Synod of Pennsylvania took the first step towards separation from the General Synod. Whether so intended or not, all who were present felt that by her action the harmony of the General Synod had been disturbed, and the relations of the Synod of Pennsylvania imperiled. It might have been a matter of some difference of opinion as to the exact significance of that act, but no one could mistake, that it portended evil. For a delegation to withdraw in open Synod, and peremptorily refuse to yield to the decision of the majority, or to act longer with them, if not a solemn farce, must have some meaning.

As here the work of separation began, it may be well to examine what actually took place. The occasion was the reception of the Franckean Synod. This was done after long discussion and deliberation, lasting some days; and after the delegates of the Franckean Synod had, in writing, given assurance of their having complied, as they understood, with the constitutional requirements. They expressly declared in their written statement, that "the members of the Franckean Synod fully understood, that they were adopting the doctrinal position of the General Synod when they adopted its Constitution." Whether the General Synod acted wisely or unwisely, we will not now inquire. After very full and free discussion the Franckean Synod was received by a vote of ninety-seven to forty. Against this action the minority protested, but there all let the matter rest, except the delegates from the Synod of Pennsylvania, who withdrew from the sessions of the General Synod, refusing to take any further part in the deliberations of the body.

When the the delegation withdrew, they directed their names to be removed from committees on which they had been placed, which was accordingly done. Their names were omitted in the calling of the roll of Synod, and also when the *ayes* and *noes* were ordered on questions before the house. They were regarded, and treated, not as absent members, but as delegates who had voluntarily withdrawn from the sessions of the General Synod, and who had, by their own deliberate act, forfeited their part in the transactions of Synod. Thus the case stood when the General Synod adjourned at York, in 1864; the delegation of the Pennsylvania Synod having withdrawn, and having no part in the business or government of the General Synod. They had been entrusted, as they claimed, with certain powers by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and made the judges of when these powers should be exercised, and they now exercised them by protesting and withdrawing to report to their Synod about to meet. The Synod approved and endorsed their action, thus making it fully its own.

Such a movement naturally and necessarily started the inquiry as to the effect of this withdrawal of the delegation, and the relations of the Synod of Pennsylvania to the General Synod. Some, and among them leading men in the Church, regarded the withdrawal of the delegation as the separation of the Synod of Pennsylvania from the General Synod, and that she was no longer a constituent part of that body. To them it was a plain question and, they thought, admitted of no dispute. Others regarded the Synod of Pennsylvania as still in the General Synod, with all her rights intact. To them it was equally clear that the withdrawal of the delegation did not withdraw the Synod, or even affect her relations to the General Synod. Both, no doubt, were sincere, though perhaps biased, by party feeling, in their judgment. But that these opposite opinions were entertained, is known to all in the least conversant with what was going on in the Church. There were others who were not so decided in their judgment, but deemed it a question which could only be properly settled, when a report was received from the Synod of Pennsylvania, and the whole matter duly considered by the General Synod.

In view of these things, the meeting of the General Synod, at Fort Wayne, was looked to with no ordinary in-

terest. It was understood, on all sides, that the position of the Synod of Pennsylvania was considered doubtful. It is vain to pretend that there was no room for any doubt, for all knew that the question was discussed everywhere in the Church, and that difference of opinion was entertained. Nor can it be said to be a question admitting of no difference of opinion, for men of judgment and ability did honestly differ in their views of the case.

General Synod at Fort Wayne.

When the calling of the roll had progressed to the place in which the names of the Synod of Pennsylvania stood, the presiding officer, Dr. Sprecher, ruled as follows:

"The Chair regards the act of delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod, by which they severed their practical relations with the General Synod, and withdrew from the partnership of the Synods in the governing functions of the General Synod, as the act of the Synod of Pennsylvania, that consequently that Synod was out of practical union with the General Synod up to the adjournment of the last convention, and as we cannot know officially what the action of that Synod has been, since she must be considered as in that state of practical withdrawal from the governing functions of the General Synod, until the General Synod can receive a report of an act restoring her practical relations to the General Synod: and as no such report can be received until said Synod is organized, the Chair cannot know any paper offered at this stage of the proceedings of the Synod as a certificate of delegation to this body."

This decision has become famous in the history of the General Synod, and in our Church controversies of the present time. It has been vehemently denounced, and the attempt made to stigmatize it as monstrous. There has been too little disposition to look at it calmly and inquire into its true character. It has been charged with ruling the Synod of Pennsylvania out of the General Synod, with disfranchising a Synod and depriving it of its just rights, and with furnishing just cause for the rending of the Church. It might be enough to say that the presiding officer never ruled the Synod of Pennsylvania out of the General Synod, and that he was particular to say so. Two points are indisputable—first, that the relations of the Synod of Pennsylvania to the General Synod had been

disturbed by the withdrawal of the delegation at York; secondly, that the present relations of the Synod of Pennsylvania to the General Synod were considered doubtful. This is all the presiding officer really decided, and left it to the General Synod to determine the question of relations when some report was received from the Synod of Pennsylvania. The presiding officer only has the power to decide on the validity of credentials, but not on the rights or relations of Synods. This was a question of the latter, and must be decided by the General Synod; and it would seem, by the General Synod when properly organized, since a report could not be received, discussed, and acted upon, pending the organization of the body.

Moreover, the presiding officer expressed great reluctance in being compelled to this decision, accompanied by the hope that an appeal would be taken, so that the house might itself settle the point. Accordingly, after the credentials of undisputed delegates had been received, an appeal was taken, and the decision of the Chair sustained by a vote of seventy-seven to twenty-four, or more than three to one.

This, according to all parliamentary usage, is final. The standing rules of the General Synod provide for an appeal in all such cases, and state how the question shall be put. The appeal was taken at the proper time, and in due form, and the judgment of the house deliberately expressed. This judgment may not be infallible, but parliamentary law and settled usage, know of no higher authority, and any attempt to resist such a decision, is factious and revolutionary. In all deliberative bodies it is the duty of the minority to submit to the decision of the majority when regularly expressed, and no one will pretend that all the forms of law and order were not here complied with.

But what was the whole force of this decision? Simply this, that the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania must wait until the General was organized and prepared to hear a report of the action of their Synod restoring relations or maintaining their separation. This was all. If in this delay of a few hours, and inability to participate in the organization, any hardship was imagined or experienced, it should not be forgotten that the General Synod had experienced quite equal inconvenience and hardship when the delegation of the Synod of Pennsylvania withdrew, denouncing her action as unconstitutional, deranging her

committees, refusing to share in the government or business of the General Synod, and thus openly and publicly bidding defiance to her decisions and her counsels. The delegation of the Synod of Pennsylvania could hardly expect to go out of the General Synod in the style it did at York, and then come in at Fort Wayne unchallenged, and as if nothing at all had occurred. They went out in open session, and might have been willing to come in the same way. They went home to report, and that their Synod might take action in the case, and as the Synod sent another delegation, it was but reasonable before taking their seats, that the General Synod should have a report of the Synod's action in the premises. This was all the General Synod demanded or desired of the Synod of Pennsylvania. Neither the presiding officer, nor the General Synod, had any official knowledge of what had been done, and it was altogether possible that the Synod might have taken such action as would render it utterly inconsistent to receive a delegation from that body. At all events it was proper for the General Synod to know the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania, by an official report, and that before her delegates resumed positions they had abandoned, and exercised rights voluntarily surrendered. They had deprived themselves, at York, of all they were now deprived of by the General Synod, and surely could not reasonably complain.

But suppose the ruling of the Chair to be an error, and the action of the body sustaining that ruling, also an error, which is by no means conceded, does the case afford any justifiable reason, or even plausible pretext, for rending the Church, and producing the evils which must necessarily follow? Can Christian men, men entrusted with the interests of Christ's kingdom on earth, justify themselves before the Church and the world in producing a schism in the Lutheran Church, on what they termed a mere technicality; not a question of faith or conscience, but a question of order, or parliamentary rule? Has ever in the history of the Church the attempt been made to rend and destroy on such trivial grounds? That the General Synod did not thrust out, or keep out, the Synod of Pennsylvania, but, on the other hand, did all that could be done to induce her to maintain the unity of the Church, will appear from the action, subsequent to the organization. The General Synod gave to the case the most patient, calm,

and considerate attention, and no word of unkindness or bitterness was heard in all the protracted discussions. A very brief statement of the action may be of service to such as were not present, or have not seen the Minutes of the General Synod.

1. As soon as the General Synod was duly organized, and before proceeding with the regular business, on motion, it was resolved that a committee of seven be appointed to consider the case of the Synod of Pennsylvania, and to report the next morning; thus giving it precedence, and the delegates were respectfully requested to report to Synod, by handing in their credentials and copies of their Minutes.*

2. When the committee reported next morning, a resolution was passed, inviting the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania to participate in the discussion, on handing in their credentials, and showing who were entitled to this privilege.

These movements, on the part of the General Synod, were met by a persistent silence on the part of the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania. The discussion proceeded, occupying Friday and Saturday. After the long and patient discussion, the General Synod adopted, in addition to other resolutions, the following:

3. "*Resolved*, That the General Synod hereby expresses its entire willingness to receive the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania."

Then, on motion of Rev. Adelberg, of the New-York Ministerium, the following resolution was unanimously adopted.

4. "*Resolved*, That the delegates from the Pennsylvania Synod be requested to waive what may seem to them an irregular organization of this body, and to acquiesce in the present organization."

On the question being asked whether this would satisfy the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the answer was given, that it was believed it would, and all were left under the impression that everything had been done that needed to be done, and that the delegates had no excuse left to remain out of the General Synod. So gratified were the members at the unanimous action, and the

* See Minutes, pp. 8 and 9.

supposed perfectly satisfactory conclusion of the perplexing question, that they united heartily in singing,

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow,"

and father Heyer, the oldest member of Synod, led the body in a prayer of thanksgiving to Almighty God for this great goodness. Those who witnessed the scene of that Saturday evening will be slow to believe that the General Synod was not actuated by the strongest feeling of brotherly love, and the most earnest desire to maintain the unity of the Church. Thus closed the week, and the hope and belief were fondly entertained that peace and concord would reign.

The Sabbath passed. Of this day we only say, that after all that had been done to secure peace, and the pulpit of the church in which the General Synod was holding its sessions, occupied by a member of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the Synod was grieved to find the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod refusing to commune with them. It was apparent that the friendly, conciliatory action of the General Synod had failed of its purpose, and that they were still resolved on further opposition.

The patience of the General Synod was well nigh exhausted. Nearly all felt that the utmost degree of forbearance and concession had been reached. Still the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod were allowed to make their response to the action of the General Synod, which was done on Tuesday morning. This response, after arraigning the General Synod, denying the constitutionality of its organization, and, consequently, the validity of its action, closed with the demand of such acknowledgments from the General Synod, as were not only derogatory to its character, but inconsistent with the very continuance of its present existence. To such demand the General Synod could not yield, however anxious to avoid all cause of a breach in the Church. After very full discussion, the final action of the General Synod was as follows:

"*Resolved*, That after hearing the response of the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod, we cannot conscientiously recede from the action adopted by this body, believing, after full and careful deliberation, said action to have been regular and constitutional; but that we re-affirm our readiness to receive the delegates of said Synod, as soon as they present their credentials in due form."

On this the delegation withdrew from the house, and at the meeting of the Pennsylvania Synod soon after in Lancaster city, made their report, which was followed by the withdrawal of the Synod of Pennsylvania from the General Synod, and also the appointment of a committee to issue an appeal for another union of Lutheran Synods.

From this review of the case, it is believed that every impartial judge will determine, that the General Synod made use of every honorable and Christian means to avoid the calamity of a schism in the Church, and that even if the Synod erred, it was no just cause for the action of the Synod of Pennsylvania. The Church has been rent asunder and, the inquiry well may be made, for what cause? The answer, thus far, must be felt to be very unsatisfactory.

We must turn now to an entirely different view of this whole subject. At Fort Wayne, and on the floor of the General Synod, it was repeated, again and again, that there were no doctrinal difficulties between the Synod of Pennsylvania and the General Synod, that all were now satisfied with the doctrinal position of the General Synod. It was declared to be entirely a question of order. But after the ground of remaining out had been taken, and still more, after it had been determined to attempt another union of Synods, it was felt that some other and stronger reason for such a step was necessary. Sober, thinking, Christian men would hardly be satisfied with the excuse for rending the Church and forming new organizations, that a few were not altogether satisfied with the ruling of a presiding officer, and that ruling sustained by an overwhelming majority. It would not look well to go on record, nor would it satisfy the Church or the world, that for such a cause, men, eminent in the Church, determined to divide and destroy, rather than yield one jot.

Some other and more weighty reasons must be found. Soon the action at Fort Wayne was declared to be of very secondary importance. It was alleged not to be the cause at all, but only the occasion of the separation. Some went so far as to say they did not care at all about the ruling of Dr. Sprecher, or the vote of the majority sustaining the Chair. It might be right, or it might be wrong, and they did not care which. They were for leaving the General Synod on entirely different grounds, and this afforded the opportunity.

Amidst a great deal of denunciation and abuse of the General Synod, of a general character, there are two points around which nearly everything of any weight may be ranged. They have been brought forward so often of late, re-echoed by so many persons, and in so many places, though probably all traceable to a very few individuals, that it is unnecessary to cite particular authorities to show the charges.

These charges are, *first*, that the General Synod is not truly Lutheran; and, *secondly*, that it has proved a failure. These are grave charges, and would furnish better reasons for abandoning the General Synod, if they could be shown to be true, than a mere question of parliamentary order. Hence the zealous efforts to show that the General Synod is undeserving the name of Lutheran, and that it has been powerless for good. It is time that these slanderous accusations should be fairly met, and their authors presented in their true light before the Church and world. The General Synod has long enough patiently submitted to the abuse of men, who eulogized it when it suited their purpose, and denounce it when in their way. We do not propose to enter on this work, at this time, at large, but only to present a few facts, which may help the candid to judge for themselves.

The enemies of the General Synod charge that body with a want of genuine Lutheranism, because of either not fully recognizing the Augsburg Confession, or of not receiving it in good faith. In reply, we have to say,

1. That the General Synod does receive, and has incorporated in her Constitution, "the Augsburg Confession, as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word." This is all that the most distinguished Lutheran divines have ever considered binding in the Augsburg Confession, and is in the very words of the declaration of the Ministerium of New York, whose Lutheranism is not questioned by those who now assail the General Synod. It may be interesting and instructive to hear the testimony of one or two witnesses from the Synod of Pennsylvania, on this very point. Dr. Seiss, President of the Board of Directors of their Theological Seminary, speaking of the Lutheran Church, says:

"She has her Confessions of faith, her liturgies, her catechisms, which she respects and loves, and which she ex-

pects all who enter her communion to regard with due honor. But she enforces none of them upon her members in the form of rigorous and compulsory law. Here and there some particular exceptions may have occurred, and may still exist; but it does not lie in the genius of our Church to enforce her utterances, in all their details, as if they were indispensable, either to Christianity or herself. She, indeed, demands the reception of every doctrine which enters into the essential life of Christianity, as contained in the Old and New Testaments, set forth in the ancient Catholic creeds, and again so lucidly exhibited and defended in her own great Confession; but, as declared by Reinhard, and maintained by the most conscientious theologians of our Church: 'Even he who has solemnly adopted and subscribed the Symbolical Books, is by no means bound to adopt every unessential point, every interpretation of a scriptural passage, every argument or opinion which they contain.'*

This is precisely the position of the General Synod in regard to the Augsburg Confession; and we presume every member of the General Synod would endorse most cordially these words of Dr Seiss. If there are any who could not, they belong to the "particular exceptions," who think Dr Seiss too catholic and liberal.

Dr. Schaeffer, Chairman of the Faculty in their Theological Seminary, maintained the very same views, and quotes the same authority,† making the distinction between essential and non-essentials, and insisting only on the former. With such men as Drs Schaeffer and Seiss, advocating the views set forth in this testimony, will it be believed that other members of the Synod of Pennsylvania arraign the General Synod for doing the very thing they advocate—requiring subscription to the Augsburg Confession only as a "correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the Divine Word, and of the faith of our Church founded upon that Word?"

Another witness may be introduced, endorsed at least by the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania and the Pittsburg Synod. The Rev. Dr. Harkey, as President of the General Synod, preached the opening sermon at the meeting of that body in Pittsburg, May, 1859. His sub-

* *Evangelical Review*, April, 1866.

† *Evangelical Review*, Vol. I. 470, 471.

ject was: "*The Mission of the General Synod*," and so pleased were all with his sentiments as to request, by a unanimous vote, its publication. This included a large delegation from the Synod of Pennsylvania, and among them Drs. W. J. Mann and C. W. Schaeffer; and from the Synod of Pittsburg, Dr. C. P. Krauth and Rev. G. Bassler. The whole discourse would furnish a suitable reply to much that is now said against the General Synod. We have only room for the following brief extract:

"But the question is, *How has the General Synod adopted the Augsburg Confession?* How could she adopt it, with the hope of uniting the Lutherans in America, and not burden the consciences of any good men among us? I reply, there was only one way possible, and as a matter of course, she *must* take this plan. She adopted it as to *fundamentals*, and to these she requires unqualified subscription. * * Objections have been urged against the expression "fundamental doctrines," as meaning one thing in the mouth of one man, and a different thing in that of another; that to some everything is fundamental, and to others only a few points. Now I cannot reply to this at length, at present, but have only to say in few words, *that there are fundamental doctrines in Christianity*, and everybody not spoiled by his theory or philosophy, knows what they are. Indeed, I feel like sternly rebuking the infidelity which lies concealed beneath this objection, as if Christians had not been able to determine, in eighteen hundred years, what are the *fundamental*, chief, or great doctrines of their holy religion. Down on all such quibbling!" We repeat this received the unanimous sanction of the General Synod, including some now most active in their efforts to destroy her, and who for this purpose assail her doctrinal position, thus expressed.

Now whilst all this cannot be denied, and the General Synod is found on the doctrinal basis, maintained by the great lights of the Church, it is met by the allegation that the Augsburg Confession is not received by her in good faith. We might demand who constituted these accusers of their brethren the keepers of their consciences, and judges of their sincerity. But we affirm, and challenge to the test, that the Synods in the General Synod are as honest in their reception of the Augsburg Confession as the Synod of Pennsylvania. They may not profess quite as

much, but neither do they present the humiliating spectacle of explaining away, or denying, what they have solemnly professed to receive. All kind of charges are rung upon the term "fundamental" employed by the General Synod, and it is declared open to every heresy, whilst these advocates of a purer Lutheran faith, insist on an unreserved subscription to the Augsburg Confession. Well, let us see how it works, and illustrate the principle by examples.

In 1865, the Synod of Pennsylvania, under the dictation of these defenders of a pure faith, resolved: "That in our judgment, all the doctrinal Articles of the Augsburg Confession do set forth fundamental doctrines of Holy Scripture."*

One year before, C. P. K., in the *Lutheran & Missionary*, had said: "The doctrine of the eleventh article, 'On Confession,' on the definition which the Augsburg Confession itself gives of what is fundamentally necessary to the unity of the Church, is not fundamental, and never has been so regarded by the Lutheran Church, in any part of the world."* This is historically true, and history will not change to suit the conscience of men who change their confession of faith with every change in the Church. Notwithstanding the decree of the Synod of Pennsylvania, it remains an historical truth, that the doctrines of the eleventh article 'On Confession,' is not fundamental, and never has been so regarded by the Lutheran Church in any part of the world." Some "particular exceptions" may have so regarded it, but not the Lutheran Church.

About five weeks after the decree of the Synod of Pennsylvania, the Editor of the *Lutheran & Missionary* gave a new confession of his faith to the Church and the world. He declares: "*The doctrinal articles of the Augsburg Confession, are all articles of faith, and all articles of faith are fundamental. Our Church can never have a genuine internal harmony, except in the Confession, without reservation or ambiguity of these articles, one and all.*" (The Italics are his own.) And then with great solemnity adds: "This is our deep conviction, and we hereby retract, before God and his Church, formally, as we have already earnestly

* Minutes, p. 33.

* *Lutheran & Missionary*, April 14, 1864.

and repeatedly done, indirectly, everything we have written or said in conflict with this our present conviction."*

Six weeks later we find the same Editor, in the same paper, attempting to explain this eleventh Article, so as to remove the difficulties of some minds about "private confession." By putting in the words "private confession" which are not in the Article, and arguing on this ground, he would have his readers believe that "the doctrinal Articles of the Confession do not enjoin "private confession" nor any other, as an Article of faith," although the eleventh Article is "on Confession," *"De Confessione,"* and explains the whole Article away in the face of the very words of the Confession and the history of the Church of that period.†

Since very conveniently getting rid of the doctrine, contained in this eleventh Article, we are again told by the same authority and in the same organ, that the Confession is a summary and just exhibition of the doctrines of which it treats." It does treat of confession and private absolution, and has one of its doctrinal articles headed, *"De Confessione."* But will any one now tell us what the Synod of Pennsylvania receives and holds on the doctrine of confession and private absolution? If this Article be, as decreed, fundamental, what do they hold and teach on the subject? We can only say, what nearly all know, that, in the true meaning and import of the Article, it is not only not treated as fundamental, but is not taught or practiced at all. Yet the General Synod is denounced for not professing to receive all as fundamental, "without reservation or ambiguity."

The seventeenth Article treats of *"Christ's return to Judgment."* It is confessedly a doctrinal article, found in the earliest creed of the Christian Church, and professed among all evangelical Churches. We do not here stop to discuss what it teaches. We simply state, what all who are conversant with the facts know full well, that in the Synod of Pennsylvania the most directly opposite views are openly taught without restraint, or show of disapprobation. The President of the Board of the Seminary constantly proclaims from his pulpit, and publishes through the press, what the Professors cannot but regard as con-

* Lutheran & Missionary, July 13th, 1865.

† Lutheran & Missionary, Aug. 24, 1865.

trary to the proper and historical sense of the Seventeenth Article of the Confession. The columns of the *Lutheran & Missionary* are supplied by men who thus utterly disagree, whilst it repeats its old cry of "the unity of the faith." Could Dr. Krauth look Dr. Sihler in the face, and say, we are one in the faith as to the Eleventh Article: or could Dr. Seiss look Dr. Schaeffer in the face and say, we are agreed in receiving, "without ambiguity," the Seventeenth Article? Will these brethren settle some trifling matters among themselves as to the Confession, or cease to lecture us about "unity of faith," and agreement in non-fundamentals? Their agreement is to profess unity of faith, and to denounce the General Synod for not professing the same, and then to disagree among themselves as much as they please. All the fine-spun theories of an ideal unity are worthless against plain and stubborn facts known to all who are not too blind to see, or too bigoted to confess, the truth. Will the Synod of Pennsylvania tell the Church and the world, not to mention other Articles, how her ministers understand, hold and teach, the Eleventh, Fourteenth and Seventeenth Articles of the Augsburg Confession? Until then will she enjoin silence upon some of her unruly members about questions which only gender strife?*

* Since the above was written we have seen some account of the "General Council of the Lutheran Church in North America," held in Reading, December 11th, 1866. Of this abortion it seems unnecessary, as it is impossible here, to take much notice. But its great swelling words, in its "fundamental principles of faith," afford a good illustration of the matter in hand. Art. IV reads: "That Confessions may be such a testimony of Unity and bond of Unity, they must be accepted in every statement of doctrine, in their own true, native, original and only sense. Those who thus set them forth and subscribe them, must not only agree to use the same words, but must use and understand those words in one and the same sense." Drs. Krauth and Seiss were delegates from the same Synod, and they either interpret the Seventeenth Article of the Augsburg Confession in a directly opposite sense, or else so interpret it, that it may suit either of two directly opposing systems. It is really wonderful that men claiming reputation for common candor and truthfulness can dare print and publish such matter. The very page of the *Lutheran & Missionary* that contains the account of this *Council of North America*, in the next column to it, has a notice of Dr. Seiss' Lectures on the Apocalypse. Do Dr. Krauth and Dr. Seiss "agree to use the same word, and understand those words in one and the same sense," touching "Christ's return to judg-

2. In the matter of the Augsburg Confession, the General Synod was greatly in advance of her enemies. While the Synod of Pennsylvania, and some others, were practically ignoring the Augsburg Confession, and all the Confessional writings of the Lutheran Church, the General Synod was engaged in giving authority to the mother symbol of Protestantism. After omitting all reference to it in her Liturgical forms for licensure and ordination, and admitting men to minister at her altars for generations, who despised all Confessions, the Synod of Pennsylvania, in 1853, the very year of her reunion with the General Synod, by a very decided vote, refused to adopt a report recognizing the binding authority of the Symbolical Books. But instead, adopted the following.

"I. *Resolved*, That we, also, in common with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, acknowledge the collective body of the Symbolical Books, as the historical and confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and that we also, like the Lutheran Church of former times, accord to the unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, an especial importance among our Symbolical Books generally.

II. *Resolved*, That we enjoin upon all the ministers and candidates of our Church, as their duty, to make themselves better and more thoroughly acquainted with these venerable documents of the faith of our fathers, than has hitherto been the case with many."

III. *Resolved*, That it is not by any means our intention hereby to diminish the absolute authority of the Holy Scriptures, but much rather to place it in the clearest light possible, and that we by no means design through these Symbols to place constraint upon the consciences of any, but much rather through them to bind the conscience to the Holy Scriptures, as the divine source of truth."

This is general enough. A mere declaration of a historical fact, without binding any body to any thing in the Symbolical Books. Well might Dr. C. F. Schaeffer characterize it as "a somewhat weak infusion."*

This was thirteen years ago, and when the Synod of ment," in the Seventeenth Article of the Confession? Some other of the "fundamental principles" are no better.

* Evangelical Review, Vol. V, 212, 213.

Pennsylvania was about to reunite with the General Synod. Up to that time there was no pledge even to the Augsburg Confession in the licensure and ordination of her ministers.

But the General Synod was, in a variety of ways, at this very time, giving currency and authority to the Augsburg Confession—as in the Constitution of her Theological Seminary, in the Professor's oath, in her form for licensure and ordination.

On this point the testimony of the Editor of the *Lutheran & Missionary* will confirm what has been said. Speaking of the General Synod, he says: "She is the offspring of a reviving Lutheranism, born in the dawn that followed the night which fell upon our Church in this land, when the patriarchal luminaries of her early history had set on earth to rise in heaven. When the General Synod came into being, Rationalism still was in the ascendant in Europe. The names of Gabler and Bretschneider, of Wegscheider and Roehr, were names which had been held high in honor in the Lutheran Church in Germany. The Church had become what such men might have been expected to make her. Where their influence prevailed she had become rotten in doctrine, destitute not only of the power of religion, but even of the decencies of its forms." * * *

"But this is not the Lutheranism which the General Synod desired to plant and perpetuate in the new world. When the Lutheran Church looked around her in her adopted land, she saw ignorance of her principles, and prejudices of every hue prevailing against her. When she looked to her native land all was thick darkness there. What was there on this side the Atlantic, or beyond it, to inspire hope? * * * It was at this crisis that the life of the Church displayed itself in the formation of the General Synod. The formation was a great act of faith, made, as the framers of her Constitution sublimely express it, in reliance 'upon God our Father, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the guidance and direction of the Holy Spirit in the Word of God. The framers of that Constitution should be as dear to us as Lutherans, as the framers of our Federal Constitution are to us as Americans. When the General Synod became completely organized by the acknowledgment of the doctrinal Articles

of the Augsburg Confession as a standard of faith, it was the only *voluntary* body on earth pretending to embrace a nation as its territory, and bearing a Lutheran name in which the fundamental doctrines of Lutheranism were the basis of union.* This is the testimony of one now acting as a leader in the work of seeking to destroy the General Synod.

We cannot forbear quoting a little further from the same number of the *Lutheran & Missionary*: "Heaven pity the fate of the man who looks upon the General Synod as having been a curse to the Church, or an inefficient worker in it,—who imagines that Lutheranism would be stronger if the General Synod were weaker; or that truth would be reared upon the ruins of what she has been patiently laboring for nearly forty years to build. Let a schism take place in her members, let loyalty to the principles she represents be seriously diminished, let the confederation she maintains be broken, and the injury to our Church in this land would be incalculable. It would be to our Church what a separation of the States would be to our Union."

We commend these words to their author, and to all confederated with him, in this work of destruction.

True, sound Evangelical Lutheran doctrine has been revived and maintained in the General Synod, and it is not too much to say that in purity of faith, and consistency of practice, she will compare well with any other portion of the Lutheran Church in the world.

But it has been said, and gravely resolved† that, "The purpose for which it (General Synod) was originally formed has signally failed," and some men have fairly outdone themselves in exposing, or trying to expose, the utter inefficiency, feebleness and worthlessness of the General Synod. It would be very easy to convict these men, out of their own mouths, of uttering contradictions, and to disprove this charge by their own testimony. Dr. C. F. Schaeffer might be cited as saying of the General Synod, now so much abused and decried: "That Synod, which has already accomplished a large amount of good, and the successful labors of which we have, during many years, ob-

* *Lutheran & Missionary*, March 17th, 1864.

† *Minutes of Synod of Pennsylvania*, 1866, Appendix, p. 23.

served with gratitude to the great Head of the Church."* Dr. Krauth, Jr., might be cited as saying: "The General Synod was a declaration on the part of the Lutheran Church in America, that she had no intention of dying or moving—that she liked this Western world, and meant to live here. And she has lived and waxed stronger and stronger, and the General Synod has been a mighty agent in sustaining and extending her beneficent work, and is destined to see a future which shall eclipse all her glory in the past. Heaven pity the fate of the man who looks upon the General Synod as having been a curse to the Church, or an inefficient worker in it!" * *

Dr. C. W. Schaeffer, for so many years President of the Synod of Pennsylvania, in his official capacity as President of the General Synod, in his sermon delivered at Lancaster, 1862, says: "The General Synod, by reason of that very prosperity which has been sent upon its labors for about forty years already, is placed under the weightiest obligations, not only to thank God, but also to take courage."

Other testimony, equally pointed and strong, might be adduced, were it necessary, from the same quarter. Men may change their sentiments, but facts will stand, and what they testify are facts.

Dr. Harkey, in the discourse already quoted, and endorsed by the delegates of the Synod of Pennsylvania and Pittsburg, says: "There has been a most wonderful increase of vital godliness in the Lutheran Church in the last twenty or thirty years. Indeed we may almost say that the whole Church, especially that portion of it, connected with the General Synod, has been regenerated. A new and spiritual life has been infused into her, and has made increase, until almost 'the whole lump is leavened.' And the main cause of this happy change is the ground taken by the General Synod."

On this point we cannot forbear citing the testimony of the moderate and faithful historian of the General Synod: "It has proved a great blessing to the Church. From its influence the happiest results have flowed. It brought into existence, and has sustained those noble institutions among us, which have been productive of so much good, and are the glory of the Church. It has united the North

* Evangelical Review, Vol. II. 38.

and the South, the East and the West, in efforts for the extension and improvement of our common Zion."* Again "The liberal basis upon which it has been founded, the tolerant and conciliatory spirit that prevails among its members, and the enlarged views and active zeal which have characterized its efforts, will ever gather round it warm and devoted friends. The late convention has placed it in an attitude before the Church, which must command respect and admiration, and has proved to the satisfaction of every reasonable mind, that the General Synod is a bond of union among us, and a rich blessing to our Lutheran Zion."†

Such are a very few, out of many, testimonials, to the General Synod, concerning which the cry has gone forth *delenda est*.

If those who thus decree the General Synod a failure, mean that she has not succeeded in establishing a rigid, intolerant, extreme Lutheranism, such as they are now seeking to propagate, the fact is freely admitted, and we add in their own language, "This is not the Lutheranism which the General Synod desired to plant and perpetuate in the new world." If they mean that she has not succeeded in uniting with her a few extreme Symbolical Synods, we again reply in their own language, "The General Synod never could have entered upon so hopeless a task as the attempt to unite Synods which regarded their differences as fundamental. After all the classifications of our theological Cuvier's, who have pretended to tell us on inspection of a single scale, or claw, exactly to what kingdom the animal belonged, which wore that scale or exercised that claw, whether warm or cold blooded, oviparous or viviparous, graminivorous or omnivorous, whether he was of the land or water, or amphibious, we beg leave to say that in our General Synod, such classification is very unnecessary, and we would deferentially add, is, in our opinion exquisitely absurd. There are not only not distinct genera, there are no distinct species in the General Synod. There is but one class, one species in it, and all the differences are simply those of varieties in one species. The true friends of the General Synod have this specific mark, that setting aside non-fundamentals as terms of min-

*Evangelical Review, Vol. V, p. 239.

†Evangelical Review, Vol. IX, p. 90.

isterial union and of Church fellowship, they meet as on fundamentals; and setting aside the munition of the mere technical phraseology of one or two features in one or two doctrines, they meet in harmony on their substance."^{*}

The General Synod does not now seek, nor has she ever sought, to magnify non-essential doctrines, or to make of chief importance those matters in which she differs from other orthodox denominations; but has aimed at a Catholic Lutheranism that might embrace the various portions of the Lutheran Church in the land, willing to unite on such a basis, and also bring her into cordial and active coöperation with other evangelical Churches in the great work of extending the Redeemer's kingdom. To this her constitution binds her, and she can only become narrow and exclusive by disregarding the very law of her own existence. It has been made of late a standing reproach by some that the Lutheranism of the General Synod differs so little from Presbyterianism, Methodism, Congregationalism, or the religion of other evangelical Churches. It seems to be imagined that we must have something, peculiar and distinctive to distinguish us from other denominations for the sake of distinction. This is of the very essence of sect, so foreign to the genius of the Lutheran Church. It is one of her chief glories, and surely is distinction enough, that she does not magnify non-essentials, and exalt them to the position of great fundamental doctrines, but rather seeks to combine all the good of all Churches. Let others, if they will, glory in their individual peculiarities, but let the Lutheran Church glory in this, that while she is thoroughly orthodox, she is liberal and Catholic, seeking to carry out the spirit of Christ, and, in this, imitating the early Church. The Augsburg Confession itself professes to contain "nothing opposed to the universal Christian Church." We repeat this is distinction, and glory enough, and the various sects may be left to boast themselves of their pet peculiarities. In contrast with this narrow sectarian view, Dr. Seiss has well said of our Church: "Indeed she has few appended peculiarities of any sort. Taking the broadest and deepest foundations of Christianity as her chief characteristics, there is nothing good and praiseworthy in Christian faith or practice, by which any have claimed distinction, which she

^{*}C. P. K., *Lutheran & Missionary*, March 31, 1864.

does not embrace within herself. * * * Our Church is both free and mild, and, in the moderation and broad catholicity of her views and spirit, she has occupied the ground of a great mediator among the conflicting parties of Christendom, presenting a doctrinal, liturgical, and governmental basis, on which all might harmonize without violence to their consciences, and which leaves no possible excuse for sectarianism. The Episcopalian can come into her communion without feeling that he has in any way departed from the Church; and the Dissenter may worship at her altars without being oppressed with stereotyped forms and tiresome routine. The Presbyterian can listen to her preachers, and hear his favorite theme of sovereign grace; and the Methodist can live in her pastures without danger to his fervor, and without reasonable offence respecting the doctrine of the decrees which he abominates."*

How grand and Christian this compared with the views and efforts of those, who would degrade the Evangelical Lutheran Church, the mother Church of Protestantism, to a mere sect, by insisting on some minor point of distinction, to separate her from the great multitude of God's sacramental host! But whether the General Synod has "signally failed" in the purpose for which it was founded will be best determined by looking at a few facts.

1. One grand object was a union among Lutheran Synods. Before the formation of the General Synod there was no bond of union among the different Lutheran Synods in the United States. They felt the need of something to unite them, and so organized the General Synod, at first embracing four Synods. Before the late war, which compelled the separation of the Southern Synods, some thirty district Synods, extending from Texas to the extreme North, and from the Atlantic to the extreme West, were harmoniously united in the General Synod. Every Synod, with a single insignificant exception, East of the Ohio river, and most of those west of it, were in connection with the General Synod. The few remaining out were such as had no fellowship even among themselves, and were distinguished for their zeal against each other quite as much as for their opposition to the General Synod of

**Evangelical Review*, April, 1866.

the Lutheran Church. Different tongues and men from various different nationalities, were blended in one, and all recognized each other as Lutherans and Christians. It is doubtful if any other leading denomination, in its highest ecclesiastical judicatory, was so well entitled to the term *General* as the General Synod of the Lutheran Church. The Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and other denominations were divided in two, besides numerous subdivisions. The effort to cast contempt on the General Synod by naming it the "So Called," is an exhibition of ignorance and prejudice, and must expose its authors to the severest animadversions of intelligent and candid Christians of all denominations. The General Synod was truly a union of Synods, numerous and influential, when in the providence of God it was partially dismembered by the withdrawal of Southern Synods. But in this, other denominations shared the same lot. And now for the Synod of Pennsylvania to withdraw, and attempt to break up the General Synod, oracularly declaring it a signal failure, is simply to utter before the world its own ignorant prejudice and hostile design.

2. Another purpose of the General Synod was to "devise plans for Seminaries of education and missionary Institutions, etc." At this time there was no Lutheran College or higher Seminary in the United States. There was no adequate provision for the education of a ministry. Soon the General Synod founded a Theological Seminary, in which have been trained already some four hundred ministers for the Church, who have preached the gospel in nearly every State of the Union, and also in heathen lands. Under the same influence Colleges have been founded, and the work of education and religion promoted. From the Theological Seminary of the General Synod have gone forth the Presidents and Professors of our Colleges, and the Professors in other Theological Seminaries, Editors, and most of the men who have been leaders in extending and building up the Lutheran Church, in city, town, and country. Foreign and Home Missionary Societies, Education Societies, the Historical Society, Publication Board, Church Extension Society, and other agencies have been established, and much done to call forth the liberality and activity of the Church. From a few hundred dollars

a year, her benevolent contributions have increased to as many hundred thousand.

3. The General Synod was designed to aid in providing "books and writings, such as catechisms, forms of liturgy, collections of hymns, etc." Peculiar difficulties attended this part of her work, not only owing to the fact that her powers were restricted, but owing to the prevalence of different languages, and the gradual and constant change going on in the churches in their transition from German to English, and in the continued accessions from the old world. Still the General Synod has not utterly failed, even in this respect. The Catechism of Luther has been constantly furnished in both languages. The Church has been supplied with a liturgy, which from time to time has been revised, and the General Synod is still seeking to improve it. A collection of hymns for Church purposes has been furnished, comparing well with the collections of any of the English Churches. Also a collection for Sunday Schools. A Sunday School paper, with a circulation of forty or fifty thousand, not to mention other publications, and the establishment of a Publication Board and Depository. Something at least has been done, and we may not despise the day of small things. Even here if the General Synod has not completely succeeded, who in the Lutheran Church has done better?

4. The General Synod was to aim not only at union among Lutheran Synods, but to be "regardful of the circumstances of the times, and of every casual rise and progress of unity of sentiment among Christians in general, in order that the blessed opportunities to promote concord and unity, and the interest of the Redeemer's kingdom, may not pass by neglected and unavailing." This she has done, by entering into correspondence with other denominations, and joining in general efforts to evangelize the world. She has coöperated with the American Bible and Tract Societies, and Sunday School Union, and like agencies, and excited the contempt of her enemies by these "unionistic efforts." But it is believed she thus secured the approval of God and of his true Church, of whatever name.

More might be said on this subject, but it is deemed unnecessary. Let the unprejudiced reader contemplate the Lutheran Church in 1820, with a few feeble Synods without union, without Institutions of learning or religion,

without proper books for instruction and devotion, almost without a name in the land, and now survey her numerous Synods, her Institutions of learning, benevolence, and religion, her growing intelligence, piety, and zeal, and then let him ask, has the General Synod signally failed? For most of this has been accomplished under the General Synod.

We are not prophets, and will not venture on predictions of the future. God may intend to try the General Synod by divisions and contentions, or he may intend to cast her down to the ground. It is no evidence that God is not with her and for her, that she is thus subject to trials and fierce oppositions. She is in the hands of the Lord, and he will do as seemeth him good. The weaknesses of her friends and the malice of her enemies shall alike, in the end, praise him. We commit all to his hands, anxious only to discharge our duty, and leave the verdict with him who judgeth righteously. A few years ago the Editor of the *Lutheran & Missionary*, ventured to predict, concerning the General Synod that "*those who strive to take her crown from her, will be remembered only by their utter and ignominious failure.*" We will not imitate his example by uttering any prophecy, but we envy not the man, when he stands before the calm judgment of the Church, or at the great tribunal of Christ, who has devoted his time, and talents, and influence, to the task of destroying, or seeking to destroy, the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States.

ARTICLE X.

THE BENEFITS OF THE COMMUNION.

By Rev. J. B. BALTZLY, A. M., Wooster, Ohio.

GOD, in his omniscience, knew minutely, exactly, precisely what benefits a Christian would need, in order to the development of his character. He instituted just such ordinances and means of grace as would accomplish this end. And, as the Christian has many peculiar wants, he

ordained many means to satisfy these wants; and every ordinance or means of grace, satisfies a special want. So that every ordinance, or means of grace, conveys its own peculiar benefit to the believer.

Prayer has the promise of a blessing of its own kind;

"It is appointed to convey
The blessings God designs to give."

Meditation has its own peculiar blessing; it discovers the *preciousness* of God's Word.

Repentance has its own blessing; it destroys the power of sin, and is a state absolutely necessary to the reception of spiritual good.

Faith has its own blessing; it secures our justification.

Attendance on public worship has its peculiar blessing; it reveals man's true character and end. The Psalmist, in speaking of the prosperity of the wicked, says: "Until I went into the sanctuary of God, then understood I their end. Surely thou didst set them in slippery places: thou castedst them down into destruction."

Baptism has its peculiar blessing; it is "the answer of a good conscience towards God:" and so in the whole range of Christian ordinances and means of grace. Every one has its own peculiar benefit. What then are the benefits of the Communion? They are very beautifully set forth in these words: "The Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do for a remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, and when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me." 1 Cor. 11 : 24, 25.

According to these words, the benefits of the Communion are two-fold :

I. *The reception of Christ's body and blood.* The great apostle to the Gentiles, says: "Take, eat; this is my *body*." And Jesus says: "*Drink* ye all of it: this is my *blood* of the New Testament." What then does the communicant eat? What does he drink? And what is the benefit of such eating and drinking? Jesus answers: "My *body* and my *blood*." But what are we to understand by the terms *body* and *blood*? The Roman Catholic Church maintains that they mean the gross material body and blood of the

Son of God. She teaches that the *bread* and *wine* are transubstantiated, or changed into *flesh* and *blood* in the consecration; that the bread is no more bread, but flesh; and the wine is no more wine, but blood; and that the priests eat and drink this flesh and blood; but the laity eat only this flesh, and drink not this blood.

Zwingle taught that they mean mere bread and wine, without any special presence of Christ at all; that Christ is no more present with the communicant in "the breaking of bread" than in the use of any other means of grace; and that the elements are received as a mere memorial of his sufferings and death.

Calvin taught that the bread and wine remained unchanged in the consecration, and that the communicant ate Christ by faith.

Luther taught that the elements of the Supper embrace the true body and blood of Christ; that the bread and wine remained unchanged by the consecration, but that *in* and *under* this bread and wine is the true, glorified, spiritual body and blood of the Son of God, as St. Paul affirms: "The bread which we break, is it not the *communion* of the *body* of Christ? And the cup which we bless, is it not the *communion* of the *blood* of Christ?"—and that as the natural mouth receives the bread and the wine, so the spiritual mouth, faith, receives the true body and blood of Christ. And because of this doctrine of the immortal Reformer, Lutherans are sometimes charged, by ignorant men and deceivers, for holding the Catholic view of the Communion. But the charge is based upon ignorance, deception and falsehood. It is devoid of all truth, full of base motives, and slanderous in its character.

There is a three-fold difference between the Romish and Lutheran view of the Communion.

1. There is a difference as to the change of the elements. Romanists claim that the elements are changed into the very body and blood of Christ. Lutherans claim that they remain unchanged by the consecration.

2. There is a difference as to the presence of the body and blood of Christ. They claim that the elements become the gross, material body and blood of Christ. We claim that the true, glorified, spiritual body and blood of Christ are in and under the elements.

3. There is a difference as to the reception of the elements. They claim that communicants eat and drink the

gross body and blood of Christ with the natural mouth. They also withhold the cup from the laity. We claim that communicants eat and drink the elements with the natural mouth, but receive the true body and blood in and under the elements with the mouth of faith. We also administer the communion to the laity in both elements. So that, after all, there is a world-wide difference between the Romish and the Lutheran view of the Communion.

But what are we to understand by the terms *body* and *blood* of Christ? What do they signify? They signify simply and verily the *life* of Christ. When Jesus said, "Take, eat: this is my body," he is to be understood to say, "Take, eat: this is my *life*, which I give for the life of the world." The same is true respecting his blood. And this interpretation I will now proceed to establish by the following course of reasoning:

St. Peter says: "We are redeemed with the precious *blood* of Christ, as of a Lamb without spot and without blemish." St. Matthew says: "The Son of Man came to give his *life* a ransom for many." So that the terms *blood* and *life* are used synonymously by St. Peter and St. Matthew. Hence, when it is said that Jesus redeemed us with his *blood*, we are to understand his *life*; for, indeed, "He gave his *life* a ransom for many." So that, when Jesus said, "This is my blood," he meant, "This is my *life*"; not that the blood or wine ceases to be blood or wine, and is changed into his life; no, not at all; but that his *life* is in communion with his blood or the wine; otherwise it would be an empty, meaningless symbol. St. Paul says: "We are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ." And St. John says: "He laid down his *life* for us." Here the terms *body* and *life* of Christ are used synonymously. Hence, when it is said: "We are sanctified through the offering of the *body* of Jesus Christ," we are to understand his *life*; for indeed, "He laid down his *life* for us." So that, when Jesus said, "This is my body," he meant, "This is my *life*;" not that the body or bread ceases to be body or bread, and is changed into the *life* of Christ, but that the *life* is in communion with his body or the bread; otherwise it also would be an empty, lifeless symbol.

But Jesus says: "I am the *life*. I am that *bread* of life. *This* is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof and not die. If any man eat

of *this bread*, he shall live forever; and the bread that I shall give, is my *flesh*." The terms *bread*, *flesh* and *life* are here used, and that by the blessed Jesus himself, synonymously, and mean one and the same thing. But the Jews said: "How can this man give us his *flesh* to eat? Jesus said unto them: Except ye eat the *flesh* of the Son of Man, and drink his *blood*, ye have no *life* in you. Whoso *eateth* my *flesh* and *drinketh* my *blood*, hath eternal life. For my *flesh* is *meat* indeed, and my *blood* is *drink* indeed. So he that *eateth me*, even he shall live forever." But some of his disciples said, when they heard this saying: "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" Jesus replied: "The words that I speak unto you are *spirit*, and they are *life*." Hence it is that Jesus took *bread*, and said: "This is my *body* or *flesh*; for he had said already: "The *bread* that I will give is my *flesh*." But this *body* or *flesh*, he says in this very chapter, "is *life*, which life I will give for the life of the world." So that, beyond all controversy, the term *bread* here denotes the *life* of Christ, by which the world is to be saved; and without *this life* there is no salvation.

But *this life* Jesus calls *body* or *bread*; and he calls it *blood* or *wine*. Therefore, when Jesus says: "Whoso eateth this bread, or my flesh, and drinketh this wine, or my blood, hath eternal life," he means this: "Whoso eateth me as the bread of life, or receiveth my life, he hath eternal life." His life is received in communion with the bread and the wine. But will any one deny this, and say that it is unreasonable as well as impossible! I answer: "All things are possible with God;" and all mysteries are reasonable to the divine, if not to the human mind. But the "*Sacramental Presence*," as held by the Lutheran Church, is a profound mystery; so also is the *incarnation* of the Son of God; and indeed all the fundamental truths of revelation and of nature; hence they are neither unreasonable, nor yet impossible. Besides, every ordinance that has no Christ in it, is a vain and useless ordinance. If so, then, if Christ be not in the Communion, it also is a vain and useless ceremony. But who will, who can believe this? Who will, who dare take Christ out of the Communion, and "eat and drink damnation to himself, not *discerning* the Lord's body?" But must *this life* of Christ be eaten? Most certainly; for Jesus says: "Take, eat;" and unless we *eat* it, there can be no *life* in us. But *how*

may it be eaten? Only by the mouth of faith. Hence he, that is not a Christian, cannot receive the *life* of Christ but only the elements; for the life of Christ can only be received by faith. This, then, is the meaning of the terms, "This is my body—this is my blood," namely: This is my *life*, truly present in the Communion, in and under the form of bread and wine, and administered and received.

But what are the special benefits of the reception of Christ's life into our souls? They are three-fold:

1. *It preserves immortal life in us.* Just as the branch would wither and die without a continual flow of the life of the vine into it; so would our spiritual life sicken and die without a constant interflow of the life of Jesus. Indeed our life is Jesus' life, just as the life of the branch is the life of the vine. And it is on this ground that Jesus said: "Verily, verily, I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no *life* in you."

2. *It nourishes immortal life in us.* The man who is truly begotten of the Holy Ghost, through the word, has a new and higher life imparted to him, and moves in a nobler and purer sphere. Having "tasted that the Lord is gracious, as a new-born babe, he desire the sincere milk of the word, that he may grow thereby." Having lost his old and vicious appetite, and obtained a new and holy relish, he needs to be fed with food adapted to the gratification of this new desire, and the nourishment of this new life, else he will pine away and die. He needs to "add to faith virtue; and to virtue, knowledge; and to knowledge, temperance; and to temperance, patience; and to patience, godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity:" he needs to go on from one degree of moral development unto another, until he attains unto perfect manhood, "Unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ Jesus." But how may he be thus developed? Whence the source of his nourishment, and the means of his growth? Evidently by and in the holy Communion of our Lord. This is a most sure and happy appliance to the attainment of this blessed end, the nourishment of the inner, spiritual, immortal life of the soul.

3. *It makes us fruitful in all things.* Just as the life of the vine gives life to the branches, and causes them to develop, to push forth buds and leaves, and bloom and fruit;

to adorn them with verdancy, beauty and freshness; to fill them with gladness, to inspire them to clap their hands under the influence of a gentle breeze; to load them with a rich, thick foliage to cast, under the warm beams of a mid-day sun, a mellow shadow beneath, under which the weary may find sweet repose: so the life of Jesus infuses life, immortal, unending life, in us; it develops our Christian character; it pushes forth the buds, the leaves, the blossoms, the fruits of Paradise, "love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, temperance." "For if these things be in us, and abound, they make us that we shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ." It adorns us with all the Christian graces and virtues; it fills us with love and zeal and truth; it makes us tall as cedars, and look gay and green, all covered thick with rich blossoms and delicious fruit. Hence Jesus says: "Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye except ye abide in me. He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit; for without me ye can do nothing." So that the Communion *preserves* and *nourishes* immortal life in us, and makes us fruitful in every good word and work.

II. *But the second general benefit of the Communion is, the preservation of a lively remembrance of Christ's sufferings, death and second coming.* "This do in remembrance of me." Jesus, in his omniscience, knew that men are as prone to forget him, "as the sparks are to fly upward." He knew that they are creatures of *time* and *sense*. He knew that they are very little influenced, and much less governed by that, which is purely spiritual and invisible, and entirely disconnected from the material and visible. He knew that they are almost wholly governed by that which they can *see* and *feel*, *touch* and *taste*. He knew that, if he did not connect the great doctrines of the atonement with something that is *visible*, *tangible* and *material*, they would altogether forget his sufferings, death and second coming. And, doubtless, without "the breaking of bread," every spark of vital godliness would long ago have been extinguished, and the gates of hell would have prevailed against the Church of the Redeemer. But for this, "the flowers would appear on earth no longer, the

time of the singing of birds would be past, and the voice of the turtle would be heard no more in the land." But for this, the fruitful plains would long ago have become a barren desert, the beautiful hills, a howling wilderness, and earth's magnificent cities, the home of dragons, owls and bats. But for this, the songs of Zion would long since have languished and died, the harpers would have hung their harps upon the willows by the rivers of Babylon, and men everywhere, all over this wide, wide world, would, to-day, bow down to stocks and stones, the workmanship of their own hands. But for this, the rippling stream and the owl's doleful moan, echoing from every hill-top and valley, from every mountain side and plain, would send up to-day the sad, melancholy requiem of departed human glory, and departed manifestations of the divine favor. But for this, the good angel of peace and mercy would long since have spread her wings, and sailed away to her native heaven. But for this, desolation and despair would have been written, with the pen of iron, and with the point of a diamond, upon every tree and shrub, and plant and flower; upon every hill-top and mountain, in every valley and plain, and universal gloom would this day over-hang this cheerful world of ours.

Hence, in order to preserve a deep, a lively, a vivid remembrance of his sufferings, his death and his second coming, Jesus made this tender appeal to their senses: "Do this in *remembrance* of me." He linked the great fundamental truths of Christianity with something that they could *see, taste, touch and handle*. He linked them with the *broken bread*, and *shed wine*. These symbolize his broken body and shed blood on Calvary. And Jesus was exceedingly fortunate in the selection of the symbols, both as to their nature and appearance. No other elements that he could have chosen would have resembled his body and his blood so much as the bread and the wine. And nothing could remind creatures of time and sense so forcibly and vividly of the broken body and shed blood of Christ, as the *broken bread* and the *poured out wine*. And no living, thinking, rational being can solemnly look upon, and contemplate these elements, without being reminded of, and deeply impressed with, the great truth that Jesus suffered and died for him. They present to him, in a most tender and affectionate manner, Jesus, as ascending

the cross, as being nailed to the rough wood, as being pierced with a spear, as being all mangled and torn, as pouring out his blood to wash away his sins, as dying, "the just for the unjust;" and thus, in visible colors of life and death, they hold up before him, as on a new canvass, that amazing, and, to us, most wonderful scene which the mad enemies of the cross beheld, that scene in which was laid on him the iniquity of us all! Here, in full view of the loveliness of virtue, on the one hand, and the deepest dye of sin, on the other; here, under the silent thunderings of the wrath of God, and the sweet whisperings of Calvary, he remembers and feels what Jesus was, and did, and suffered for human redemption; and he sighs and longs to share in the blessings of his sacrifice!

This, then, is one special benefit of the Communion. The preservation of such a remembrance of his sufferings, death and second coming, as causes mankind to sigh and long for deliverance from sin in the blood of Jesus. A second special benefit of the Communion is, that it gives such a clear, full and vivid representation of the sacrifice of Christ, as no other ordinance, or means of grace, can furnish. It is the only *visible* ordinance that can remind us of Christ—his sufferings, his death, and his second coming. And a third special benefit of the Communion is, than it strengthens the bond of Christian union. There is scarcely any thing so sweet, so lovely, so charming, so pleasant, so gladsome, and so good, as for Christians "to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." The Psalmist exclaims: "Behold, how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard; that went down to the skirts of his garments; as the dew of Hermon, and as the dew that descended upon the mountains of Zion; for there the Lord commanded the blessing, even life for evermore." But how may we secure such a bond of Christian union? Evidently by the Communion. Those who worthily celebrate the dying love of Jesus, experience their icy hearts melting, their bands of discord breaking, their feelings flowing together, and their Christian graces imperceptibly uniting. St. Paul says: "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? and the cup which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?"

And he then breaks forth in a sweet strain on Christian union, saying: "We are *all one* in Christ Jesus; for we being many are one bread, and one body; for we are all *partakers* of that one bread." Yes, "we are all *partakers* of that one bread," we all meet around one table, and eat of one bread, and drink of one cup, and commune with one Lord; therefore, "we are all one in Christ Jesus." So reasons St. Paul. And is it not true, that Christians appear, at least ostensibly, at the table of the Lord as common dependents on the same grace, as open professors of the same religion, as common followers of the same Lamb, as attached to the same Jesus, as having a common interest in the same death—as living for the glory of the same Redeemer, as united together in the same cause, as honoring the same Lord, as looking for the appearing of the same Messiah, and as common heirs of the same kingdom? Christians, indeed, as they linger sweetly and solemnly around the sacred board, experience their confidence in each other increasing, their feelings flowing tenderly together, their love for each other glowing with intense ardor, and their joy in each other springing up in their souls as sweet incense unto the Lord. Just as when the ten thousand rivulets, running together form one strong overwhelming stream, so their feelings, flowing in one grand, majestic channel up into the great ocean of love in Jesus Christ, will so entwine themselves in each others embrace and so strengthen "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace," that Omnipotence may not sever, and eternity not weaken them! And, besides all this, they, by their common communion, show that they are united in "one body, and one spirit, even as they are called in one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in them all; till they all come into the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ!"

ARTICLE XI.

THE MISSOURI SYNOD.

THE following Theses were officially announced for discussion at the meeting of the Missouri Synod, appointed to be held at St. Louis, on the 31st of October, 1866.

Theme: The Evangelical Lutheran Church, the true visible Church of God upon earth.

THESIS I. The one, holy Christian Church upon earth, or the Church in the true sense of the word, out of which there is no salvation, is, according to God's Word, the totality of all who truly believe on Christ, and who are sanctified by this faith. Matt. 16 : 18; Eph. 5 : 23—27; Heb. 3 : 6.

THESIS II. The one, holy, Christian Church, as a spiritual temple, can, indeed, not be seen, but must be believed upon, yet there are, nevertheless infallible external tokens, by which its presence can be recognized, which tokens are the pure preaching of the Word of God, and the uncorrupted administration of the holy sacraments. 1 Pet. 2 : 5; 2 Tim. 2 : 19; Gal. 4 : 26; Mark 4 : 26—7; (comp. v. 14 and Matt. 13 : 38); Is. 55 : 10, 11; Matt. 28 : 18—20; Mark 16 : 16; 1 Cor. 12 : 13.

THESIS III. In a figurative (uneigentlich) sense all those visible communions are called Churches in the Scriptures, which, indeed, consist not only of believers, and those sanctified by faith, but also of hypocrites and ungodly persons mixed up with these, among whom, however, the gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the gospel. Matt. 18 : 17; 1 Cor. 1 : 2; Rev. 3 : 7.

THESIS IV. In the Scriptures even those communities are called Churches that have *partly fallen away* from the true doctrine of the Word of God, as long as they essentially retain the Word of God. Gal. 1 : 2, comp. 5 : 4, 7.

THESIS V. Communities that still essentially retain the Word of God, but obstinately err in *fundamental* doctrines of the Word of God; are, *so far as they do this*, ac-

ording to the Word of God, not Churches, but sects, *i. e.*, heretical communities. 1 Cor. 11 : 19; Tit. 3 : 10, 11; Rom. 16 : 17; Acts 20 : 30; 1 Tim. 4 : 1; 2 Tim. 2 : 17, 18; 2 Pet. 2 : 1—3.

THESIS VI. Communities which destroy the unity of the Church through errors not fundamentally ruinous, or for personal preferences, or for the sake of ceremonies, or to save life, are, according to God's Word, "divisions," (*schismata*) or separatistic communities. 1 Cor. 11 : 18, comp. 1 : 10—13; Heb. 10 : 24—5; 1 Jno. 2 : 19.

THESIS VII. Communities, which call themselves Christian, but which do not recognize the Word of God as the Word of God, and therefore deny the triune God, are, according to the Word of God, not Churches, but synagogues of Satan and temples of idols. Rev. 2 : 9; 1 Jno. 2 : 22—3, 5 : 20, 21.

THESIS VIII. Christian authors do indeed, sometimes designate all those communities which essentially hold the Word of God as *true, i. e., real Churches* in contrast with those that are not Churches; but only that is a *true visible Church*, in an *absolute sense*, in contrast with the heretical Churches or sects, in which the Word of God is purely preached, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the gospel. Jno. 8 : 31, 32, 10 : 3—5; Eph. 4 : 3—6; 1 Cor. 1 : 10.

THESIS IX. Whilst it is impossible, according to the divine promises, that the one, holy, Christian Church should ever perish, yet it is possible, and has sometimes happened, that there was no true *visible Church* of God, in the absolute sense of the term, in which, namely, by the agency of an uncorrupted public ministry, the preaching of the pure Word of God, and the administration of the uncorrupted sacraments were practiced. 1 Kings 19 : 10—18; 2 Thess. 2 : 1—12; Matt. 24 : 24; Luke 18 : 7; 1 Tim. 4 : 1—3; 2 Tim. 4 : 3, 4; Rev. 12 : 6

THESIS X. The Evangelical Lutheran Church is the totality of all those who confess, without reservation, the doctrine brought again to light through the Reformation of Luther, and submitted summarily in writing, in 1530, at Augsburg, to the Emperor, and repeated and developed in the other so-called Lutheran Symbols, as the true doctrine of the Divine Word.

THEESIS XI. The Evangelical Lutheran Church is not the one, holy, Christian Church, without the pale of which there is no salvation, although it has never separated itself from the same, but claims to belong to it alone.

THEESIS XII. If the Evangelical Lutheran Church has the tokens that in her midst the gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the gospel, then is she also the true visible Church of God on earth.

THEESIS XIII. The Evangelical Lutheran Church acknowledges the written Word of the apostles and prophets as the *only and perfect* source, rule and guide and judge of all doctrine. Deut. 4 : 2 ; Josh. 23 : 6 ; Is. 8 : 20 ; Luke 16 : 29 ; Gal. 1 : 8, 9 ; Rev. 22 : 18, 19 ; Jno. 20 : 31 ; 2 Tim. 3 : 14, 15, 16, 17. *a.* Not reason—1 Cor. 2 : 14. *b.* Not traditions—Matt. 15 : 9. *c.* Not new revelations ; Heb. 1 : 1, 2, 12 : 27—8 ; Acts 1 : 8 ; Eph. 2 : 20.

THEESIS XIV. The Evangelical Lutheran Church firmly believes in the intelligibility of the Holy Scriptures. (Opinions—open questions) Ps. 19 : 9, 119 : 105 ; 2 Pet. 1 : 19 ; 2 Cor. 4 : 3, 4.

THEESIS XV. The Evangelical Lutheran Church acknowledges *no human interpreter* of the Holy Scriptures, whose interpretation, because of his office, is to be regarded as infallible and binding. 1 Pet. 1 : 20. *a.* Not a single person. *b.* Not a special class. *c.* Not a particular, nor a universal council. *d.* Not a whole Church.

THEESIS XVI. The Evangelical Lutheran Church receives the Word of God *as it explains itself* : *a.* She accepts only the decision of the original text. *b.* In the interpretation of words and sentences, she adheres to the *usus loquendi*. Ex. 30 : 11—14. *c.* She holds the literal sense to be the only true sense. *d.* She holds that each passage has only one literal sense. *e.* She is guided in the interpretation of a passage by its design and the context. *f.* She acknowledges that the literal sense of a passage may be conveyed by terms used figuratively, or by those used in their ordinary signification, but she does not deviate from the literal meaning of a word or sentence, unless compelled to do so by the Scriptures themselves : either, namely, by the circumstances of the text itself, or by a parallel passage, or by the analogy of faith. *g.* She interprets obscure passages by those that are clear. *h.* She

extracts the articles of faith from those passages in which these are deposited, and judges by these all concurrent expressions upon the same topics. *i.* She rejects at once every interpretation that does not coincide with the analogy of faith. Rom. 12 : 7.

THESIS XVII. The Evangelical Lutheran Church accepts the *whole* of the written Word of God (as the Word of God), regards nothing contained therein as superfluous or of small account, but everything as necessary and important, and accepts, also, all the doctrines which are legitimately deduced from the written Word. Matt. 22 : 29—32.

THESIS XVIII. The Evangelical Lutheran Church gives to every doctrine of the Word of God *the place and the importance* which is assigned it in the Word of God: *a.* As the fundamental and central and crowning doctrine of all she regards the *doctrine concerning Christ*, or concerning *Justification*. *b.* She sharply distinguishes between the law and the gospel. *c.* She sharply distinguishes between the fundamental and non fundamental doctrines contained in the Scriptures. *d.* She rigidly discriminates between what is commanded and what is allowed in the Word of God (*Adiaphora*—Church Government). *e.* She distinguishes strictly and carefully between the Old and the New Testament.

THESIS XIX. The Evangelical Lutheran Church acknowledges no doctrine as an article of faith, which has not been shown with indisputable certainty to be contained in the Word of God. Jno. 8 : 31—2; Eph. 4 : 14; 2 Tim. 3 : 7.

THESIS XX. The Evangelical Lutheran Church holds in high estimation the gift of scriptural interpretation as it is imparted by God to certain individuals. 1 Thess. 5 : 20; 1 Cor. 14 : 32.

THESIS XXI. The Evangelical Lutheran Church is sure that the doctrine contained in her symbols, is the pure, unadulterated, divine truth, because it agrees, in all points, with the written Word of God. Therefore she desires of her members, and especially of her teachers, that they confess and declare their adherence to these Symbols without reservation, and refuses all fraternal and ecclesiastical fellowship with those who reject her Confession, either in whole, or in part. 2 Jno. 10 : 11; 2 Cor. 6 : 14; Rom. 16 : 17; Tit. 3 : 10.

THESIS XXII. The Evangelical Lutheran Church administers the holy sacraments according to Christ's appointment.

THESIS XXIII. True Evangelical Lutheran Churches are those, and only those, in which the doctrine of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, as it is laid down in her Symbols, is not only officially acknowledged, but also held forth in the public preaching of the gospel. Jer. 8 : 8.

THESIS XXIV. The Evangelical Lutheran Church holds the fellowship of confession and of love with all those who are of one faith with her.

THESIS XXV. The Evangelical Lutheran Church is shown to possess all the essential marks of the visible Church of God upon earth as they are found in other known communions of any other name.

ARTICLE XII.

NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS.

The Acts of the Apostles. An Exegetical and Doctrinal Commentary. By Gotthard Victor Lechler, D. D., Ordinary Professor of Theology, & Superintendent at Leipsic. With Homiletical Additions. By Rev. Charles Gerok, Superintendent at Stuttgart. Translated from the second German edition, with additions. By Charles F. Schaeffer, D. D., Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, Philadelphia. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. We welcome another volume of this great and comprehensive work, and cordially renew our commendation of the two volumes that have preceded it. No enterprise of the kind has ever been undertaken with so large a combination of force, uniting with original research the most valuable results of exegetical and homiletical labor, past and present, and comprising all that is essential to a critical, thorough, evangelical and suggestive commentary. When completed, it will be the most satisfactory exposition of the Scriptures ever attempted, surpassing in value any other now existing. The plan and direction of the whole work is under the superintendence of Dr. Lange, while the general care and supervision of the American translation has been committed to Dr. Schaff, who has associated with him some of the most eminent scholars in the country. The volume before us is the third in the series. The exegetical and critical portion was prepared by Prof. Lechler, so well

VOL. XVIII. No. 69. 21

acquainted with the whole literature of the subject, and favorably known as the author of a "History of English Deism," and "The Apostolic and post-Apostolic Age." The Homiletical and Practical matter was furnished by Rev. Charles Geroock, not only an eminent pulpit orator, but one of the most distinguished German poets of the present day. Of the merits of the translation by Dr. Schaeffer, it seems scarcely necessary to speak, as he has not for this kind of work his superior in the country. Thoroughly acquainted with the German and English, preaching with equal acceptance in both languages, a man of more than ordinary culture, a diligent student, a ripe Biblical scholar, accurate, thorough in everything which engages his attention, he gives evidence, on every page, of the care and fidelity, with which he has performed his labor. But important as his services are in presenting the work to the American public in idiomatic English, he has done more. He has made many valuable additions to the original, particularly in connection with the various readings, especially that of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, rescued from obscurity by Tischendorf, and other texts. He has also introduced new and independent expositions, notes philological and geographical, based upon a more extensive study of that interesting portion of the Scriptures, and occasionally appended brief homiletical sketches, thus rendering the work still more complete and valuable than the original. The typographical execution of the work is admirable, and all that could be desired. We feel assured that the enterprise, in which all denominations of Christians are interested, must meet with a reception, proportionate to its merits.

Commentary on the Gospels: Intended for Popular Use. By D. D. Whedon, D. D. Matthew—Mark. New York: Carlton & Porter. This volume is a valuable contribution to the sacred literature of the times. The matter is mainly expository, designed to furnish a concise and clear explanation of the text. It gives the results of careful research without any parade of learning, and seems very well adapted to the objects for which it was prepared. It may be commended for its sound sense and vivacious style, and its high spiritual tone. We are glad to notice that Dr. Whedon proposes to "complete an entire exposition of the New Testament," on a plan similar to that of the first two volumes.

A Concise Dictionary of the Bible, comprising its Antiquities, Biography and Natural History. Edited by William Smith, LL. D. Boston: Little, Brown & Co. The "Dictionary of the Bible," the last published of Dr. Smith's valuable series of Dictionaries, embraces three large volumes, and whilst the work is admirably adapted to the wants of scholars, is, in consequence of its size and price, less fitted for general circulation. The present volume is a condensation of the larger work, made by William Aldis Wright, Librarian of Trinity College, a man of eminent ability, under the direction and superintendence of Dr. Smith. Much of the erudition and the minute details, found in the original work, are here omitted and the results of research without the processes in support of these results, presented. The Editor says his main object has been to place within the reach of every Christian a popular abstract of a work which has received the approval of those most competent to express an opinion on the subject, and the effort, we are sure, has been most successful.

The Book of Common Prayer, as amended by the Westminster Divines, A. D. 1661. Edited by Charles W. Shields, D. D. With an His-

torical and Liturgical Treatise. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton. This is an interesting and important contribution to ecclesiastical history. It is designed to serve as a memorial of the learned divines of the Westminster Assembly, to furnish members of the Church forms of devotion which have been used by the pious in all ages, to provide a manual of examples and materials of divine service for Pastors, and others, called to conduct public worship, and to increase a spirit of catholicity among such Churches of the Reformation as originally contributed to the formation of the Prayer-Book by restoring to more general use those ancient formulas which are a common inheritance. To the work is appended an able and learned treatise by Dr. Shields, giving the history, warrant and analysis of the Presbyterian Book of Common Prayer. Those who have never examined the subject will be surprised to find, how the Presbyterian Church in its early history went in its advocacy and adoption of liturgical services. Mr. Claxton has brought out the work in elegant style.

The Rise and the Fall; or, the Origin of Moral Evil. New York: Hard & Houghton. This anonymous treatise is divided into three parts: I. The Suggestions of Reason; II. The Disclosures of Revelation; III. The Confirmations of Theology. The leading thought presented is that the original transgression of Adam in Eden was not a sin, but a voluntary act, by which he chose to become a moral agent, having been previously created an intellectual creature without any moral ideas and perceptions, and therefore not responsible for his conduct. The choice is supposed to have been in entire accordance with the designs of God, and just in its results to Adam and his race. A considerable portion of the work is devoted to a minute examination of the history of our first parents, as contained in the first three chapters of Genesis. To the author's theory there will be a general dissent, and among other objections to it, we cannot see how an individual could intelligently choose whether he would, or would not, have a conscience, unless he had in advance some proper conception of conscience. The production is, however, able, original and ingenious, closely and logically presented. No information is communicated in reference to the author himself, except his adherence to the Horatian rule concerning the manuscript,

"Nonum prematur in annum,

Membris intus positis."

History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin. By J. H. Merle D'Aubigné, D. D. Vol. IV. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. This volume presents, in connexion with the Reformation, the prominent events that transpired in England, Geneva, France, Germany and Italy. It begins with the period when England threw off the Papacy, from the fall and death of Wolsey, and concludes with the Gospel at Naples and at Rome, 1520—1536. The present volume in interest and importance is equal to any of its predecessors.

The Draytons and the Davenants: A Story of the Civil Wars. By the author of the "Chronicles of the Schöenberg-Cotta Family." New York: M. W. Dodd. Mrs. Charles shows in this, her latest work, the same extraordinary power and skill which distinguish her previous productions. We have here presented a portraiture of domestic life in Cromwell's times. The Draytons represent the Parliamentary adherents, and the Davenants, the Cavaliers, during the Civil Wars in England. Glimpses of society, more or less distinct are given and the prominent characters that exerted an influence in that important period

of English history, vividly brought to view. Independently of the charming interest excited by the narrative it possesses no little historical value for the general reader. The book combines instruction and entertainment and will be received with favor by the many admirers of the gifted and popular author.

Heaven Opened. A Selection from the Correspondence of Mrs. Mary Winslow. Edited by her Son, Octavius Winslow, D. D. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. This attractive volume on tinted paper presents the familiar correspondence, extensive and varied, of one of the most gifted women, written in an easy and graceful style, and breathing a spirit of the purest piety and the most heavenly devotion. As we read its devout utterances, we can understand how such a mother should have trained up sons, who have been so eminent in the service of the Master. The book will be found a suitable devotional companion for the soul, when it longs to be raised above the scenes of earth and wafted towards heaven.

The Omnipotence of Loving-Kindness: Being a Narrative of the Results of a Lady's Seven Months' Work among the Fallen in Glasgow. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. This volume gives an account of the exertions of a Christian woman in Glasgow to reclaim the erring to the paths of purity and virtue. It reveals the power of well-directed labor, the influence of Christian love and kindness in reaching the most obdurate heart, in reforming the most hopeless and abandoned cases. Some of the narratives given, are most thrilling, and show how persevering effort at last triumphs over obstacles, often regarded as insurmountable.

Songs of Praise and Poems of Devotion in the Christian Centuries. With an Introduction. By Henry Coppee, LL. D. Philadelphia: E. H. Butler & Co. This is a magnificent volume, in artistic merit, perhaps, unsurpassed by any work that has been issued from the American press. The Editor, Dr. Coppee, has shown great taste and skill in the performance of the task assigned him. He has gathered together pieces, old and new, the Greek Hymns of Neale with other rare and beautiful poems, some of the sweetest lyrics in the language, which cannot fail to interest and instruct the reader. In the Introduction he gives us valuable suggestions on the character of the Hymn, and corrects prevailing errors on the subject. The work is richly and profusely illustrated, executed in the highest perfection of the art. It is printed on thick, tinted paper, in large and beautiful type, and bound in Turkey morocco, presenting a most attractive appearance and reflecting very great honor on the enterprising publishers.

Hopefully Waiting and other Verses. By Anson D. F. Randolph. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. This volume consists of fugitive poems that have appeared at different times, collected by the author in the present form, at the request of the publisher. They breathe the spirit of genuine poetry and reveal a heart awake to the most tender emotions. A deep religious tone pervades the verses, and the portraits of domestic life, its joys and its sorrows, are as truthful and touching as they are beautiful and poetic. The author is a man of taste and of genius, and some of the pieces will bear a comparison with the poetry of Longfellow.

Great in Goodness. A Memoir of George N. Briggs, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, from 1844 to 1851. By William C. Richards. With Illustrations. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. The

career of such a man as the subject of the present Memoir is an example which ought not to be lost. It is a model for the study of young men. From humble life he rose by his own merit, to the highest honors his State could confer upon him, and his course as the poor boy, the young honest lawyer, the wise counsellor, the distinguished statesman, the upright judge, the active and consistent Christian is faithfully traced. For twelve years he was a member of Congress, and he also filled the gubernatorial chair. The steadfast friend of every good cause, the early champion of the Temperance Reform, devoted to the missionary enterprise, and interested in all works of Christian charity, a man of earnest and fearless spirit, he exerted an extended and most salutary influence. No stain ever rested upon his character. No one ever charged him with want of principle.

History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth. By James Anthony Froude. Reign of Elizabeth. In Two Volumes. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. These volumes are a continuation of Froude's most valuable history, and exhibit the same sterling qualities which characterize the preceding productions of his pen. We are acquainted with no author who sheds so much light on English History, civil and ecclesiastical, in its relations to the Protestant Reformation. Many points before obscure, are elucidated in reference to this important historical era. The work is written in so clear, chaste and graphic the style, and a narrative so vividly presented as to enchain the reader's attention and produce a deep impression. It is a noble contribution to the History of England in its transition to those institutions which have rendered her name powerful and her career glorious, and the American publishers are entitled to our gratitude for placing so beautiful an edition of the work within the reach of the American public.

A History of New England, from the discovery by Europeans to the Revolution of the Seventeenth Century, being an abridgement of his "History of New England during the Stuart Dynasty." By John Gorham Palfrey. In Two Volumes. New York: Hurd & Houghton. Dr. Palfrey is very high authority on any subject connected with the history of New England. The present volumes are an abridgement of the larger work in three volumes. The author divides the history of New England into three portions, each consisting of eighty-six years, the third concluding with the 19th of April, 1861, the second extending from the 19th of April, 1689, to the 19th of April, 1775. The present work is devoted to the first, reaching from 1602 to 1689. Whilst the work possesses little literary merit, the facts, which it contains, make it a most valuable and permanent addition to our literature, and a convenient manual for reference, in relation to the general character and early fortunes of our country.

The Rebellion Record: A Diary of American Events. Edited by Frank Moore. New York: D. Van Nostrand. Part LIX, containing striking Portraits of Generals Reynolds and Newton, has been received. This number concludes the ninth volume, and is filled with valuable documents, indispensable for reference to those who are interested in the history of the late Civil War.

Hours at Home. New York: C. Scribner & Co. This excellent monthly has been long enough before the public to establish its position. We again cordially commend it to our readers. The last number con-

tains many excellent articles, and among them a most valuable and opportune contribution by Dr. Hunt on the Cholera and the Board of Health, showing a familiar and practical acquaintance with the subject, and a characteristic article on Dr. Noah Porter by Dr. Bushnell.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine. New York: Harper & Brothers. The illustrations in the December number are interesting and attractive, whilst the contributions generally are excellent and varied, combining instruction and entertainment. Harper fills a place in our periodical literature which no other magazine does.

The Atlantic Monthly, devoted to Literature, Science, Art and Politics. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. The last number of the year comes to us freighted with a valuable series of contributions from some of the most distinguished writers of the country. John Neal opens with an interesting article on John Pierpont, Reynolds gives us one on Borneo and Rajah Brooke, Tackerman, Through Broadway, Palmer, My Heathen at Home, and Hazewell, The Fall of Austria. The "passages from Hawthorne's Note-Books" are, as usual, original and suggestive. The Atlantic is one of our best American Magazines. It is always interesting and instructive.

Our Young Folks: An Illustrated Magazine. For Boys and Girls. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. The experienced and enterprising publishers seem to spare no pains to make this the prince of juvenile magazines. New features are continually added to increase its value. Its beautiful typography and illustrations, and its excellent reading matter give it a high place in the affections of the young, whilst those of larger growth find, that they may derive pleasure as well as profit from a perusal of its pages.

The Riverside Magazine, for Young Folks. New York: Hurd & Houghton. This is new claimant for public favor, designed to gratify the varied taste of the juvenile public with genial and salutary reading, and illustrated by attractive designs. Some of the best writers in the country have been secured as contributors to the work. The January number, so beautifully printed, is now before us and fully sustains the promises of its excellent publishers.

A Great National Picture. A Photographic group of the members of Congress who voted for the amendment of the Constitution abolishing slavery from the land, together with the Portraits of Lincoln and Hamlin, has been kindly laid on our table by G. M. Powell, Esq. We have examined the picture with much satisfaction, and have had no difficulty in identifying the faces of those whom we have met. Not only as a work of Art is it admirable and deserving of high praise, but as a memorial of a most important event in our country's history, it cannot fail to awaken general interest and secure public favor.

The Eclectic Sabbath School Hymn Book. Compiled by an old Sunday School Superintendent, assisted by a number of Sunday School Teachers and others. Baltimore: T. N. Kurtz.

Discourse delivered in the Second Lutheran Church of Selinsgrove, Penn. On Thursday, Dec. 7th, 1865, the day appointed by the President of the United States, as a day of National Thanksgiving for the Restoration of Peace. By Rev. S. Dozer, A. M. Selinsgrove. 1866.

Discourse delivered at the opening of the Synod of New Jersey. By Rev. J. T. Duffield, D. D. Philadelphia: James S. Claxton.

CONTENTS OF NO. LXIX.

| Article. | Page. |
|--|-------|
| I. INAUGURATION ADDRESSES—CHARGE,..... | 1 |
| By A. H. LOCHMAN, D. D., President of the Board of Directors. | |
| “ INAUGURATION ADDRESSES—ADDRESS,..... | 6 |
| By CHARLES A. HAY, D. D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis. | |
| “ INAUGURATION ADDRESSES—ADDRESS,..... | 14 |
| By MILTON VALENTINE, D. D., Professor of Church History and Ecclesiastical Polity. | |
| II. REMINISCENCES OF DECEASED LUTHERAN MIN- ISTERS,..... | 25 |
| III. BAPTISMAL REGENERATION,..... | 46 |
| By Prof. D. WORLEY, A. M., Canton, O. | |
| IV. DR. SHEDD'S HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE, 56 | |
| By Prof. CHARLES P. KRAUTH, D. D., Philadelphia. | |
| V. SCHISM AND PROTESTANTISM,..... | 82 |
| By Rev. JACOB WEIDMAN, A. M., Baltimore. | |
| VI. ORIGIN OF CHRISTMAS PRESENTS,..... | 94 |
| By Prof. L. W. HEYDENREICH, Bethlehem, Pa. | |
| VII. ANANIAS AND SAPPHIRA,..... | 103 |
| By E. GREENWALD, D. D., Easton, Pa. | |
| VIII. JOHN'S MESSAGE,..... | 110 |
| By Prof. J. F. WILKEN, Gettysburg, Pa. | |
| IX. THE GENERAL SYNOD AND ITS ASSAILANTS,... | 120 |
| By Prof. J. A. BROWN, D. D., Gettysburg, Pa. | |
| X. THE BENEFITS OF THE COMMUNION,..... | 147 |
| By Rev. J. B. BALTZLY, A. M., Wooster, Ohio. | |
| XI. THE MISSOURI SYNOD,..... | 157 |
| XII. NOTICES OF NEW PUBLICATIONS,..... | 161 |

The Evangelical Quarterly Review. Edited by Dr. M. L. Stoever, Professor in Pennsylvania College. October, 1866. Contents: I. The Dependence of the Church upon the Holy Spirit, by Rev. Dr. F. W. Conrad. II. Credulity of Unbelief, by Rev. Dr. W. B. Sprague. III. Reminiscences of Deceased Lutheran Ministers, by Professor Stoever. IV. Progress of the Gospel, by Rev. Dr. H. L. Baugher. V. Samuel Johnson, by S. Austin Allibone, LL.D. VI. The Early History of Lutheranism in Illinois, by Rev. Dr. S. W. Harkey. VII. The Trinity, by Rev. Dr. J. A. Brown. VIII. The Conversion of Children, by James Macfarlane, A. M. IX. Book Notices. The list of the subjects of the different articles, with the names of their authors, is sufficient to show the character of the last number. The *Review* is always good, but this is unquestionably one of its best numbers. It presents a greater variety than usual, both in the subjects and literary character of the articles. Some are profound theological discussions, as the article on the Trinity. Some are exceedingly interesting, as the article on Samuel Johnson. To particularize the merits of each separate article would require more time and space than we can at present command.—*Lutheran Observer*.

The October number of this admirable *Review* is received. The fact that the work commands the talents of such distinguished divines as Doctors Baugher, Sprague, Brown, Conrad, and others, is sufficient guarantee of its worth. In the present number we find a most valuable contribution to the literature of our Church from the pen of J. A. Brown, D. D., Professor of Didactic Theology of the Gettysburg Seminary, on "Article First of the Augsburg Confession."—*Evangelical Lutheran*.

No. LXVIII, for October, of this valuable publication has been received. It is an excellent number. We were especially interested in the articles on the Dependence of the Church upon the Holy Spirit, by Dr. Conrad, on the Early History of Lutheranism in Illinois, by Dr. Harkey, and on the Trinity by Dr. Brown. Such a chapter of history, as furnished by Dr. Harkey, will be highly appreciated, and we only wish that more materials of the same kind were collected and published. Dr. Brown's Lecture on the First Article of the Augsburg Confession is an able production. Such a number as this is a high recommendation of the *Review*.—*Lutheran Standard*.

The articles are all well written. The one on Dr. Johnson is quite entertaining.—*New York Evangelist*.